

reference collection book



kansas city
public library
kansas city,
missouri



From the collection of the

j f d
y z n m k
x o PreLinger h
u v q g a
e b t s w p c

San Francisco, California
2006

SEP 11 1967

**AMERICAN PLANNING
AND CIVIC ANNUAL**



The Thomas Jefferson Memorial designed by John Russell Pope, was dedicated by President Roosevelt on April 13, 1943, the bicentennial of Thomas Jefferson's birth.

AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ANNUAL

A RECORD OF CIVIC ADVANCE IN THE FIELDS OF PLANNING, PARKS, HOUSING, NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT AND CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES, INCLUDING ADDRESSES DELIVERED AT THE NATIONAL CITIZENS PLANNING CONFERENCE ON FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND LOCAL PLANNING, HELD IN WASHINGTON BY THE AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION FEBRUARY 5-9, 1956, AND ADDRESSES DELIVERED AT THE 26TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON STATE PARKS, HELD IN THE GRAND TETON NATIONAL PARK, WYOMING ON SEPTEMBER 7-11, 1956, INCLUDING THE ROLL CALL OF THE STATES.

EDITED BY

HARLEAN JAMES

AMERICAN PLANNING AND
CIVIC ASSOCIATION

901 UNION TRUST BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

1956

THE AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ANNUAL is sent out to all paid members of the **AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION** and the **NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON STATE PARKS**, who may purchase extra copies for \$2 each.

The public may purchase past American Planning and Civic Annuals as well as the current ANNUAL for \$3 each.

Mount Pleasant Press
J. HORACE MCFARLAND CO.
Harrisburg, Pa.

352
A5
1956

AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION

PAST PRESIDENTS

J. HORACE MCFARLAND

FREDERIC A. DELANO

HORACE M. ALBRIGHT

Charles Phelan - Ex. Sec

OFFICERS AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

HORACE M. ALBRIGHT, New York, N. Y., *Chairman of the Board*

U. S. GRANT 3RD, Washington, D. C., *President*

HARLAND BARTHOLOMEW, St. Louis, Mo., *First Vice-President*

TOM WALLACE, Louisville, Ky., *Second Vice-President*

CARL FEISS, Washington, D. C., *Third Vice-President*

C. F. JACOBSEN, Washington, D. C., *Treasurer*

HARLEAN JAMES, Washington, D. C., *Executive Secretary*

FLAVEL SHURTLEFF, Marshfield Hills, Mass., *Counsel*

MRS. DORA A. PADGETT, Washington, D. C., *Librarian*

FREDERICK J. ADAMS, Cambridge, Mass.

RUSSELL VAN NEST BLACK, New Hope, Pa.

T. LEDYARD BLAKEMAN, Detroit, Mich.

DAVID D. BOHANNON, San Mateo, Calif.

WILLIAM S. BONNER, Fayetteville, Ark.

DANIEL H. BURNHAM, Chicago, Ill.

PAUL CARRINGTON, Dallas, Tex.

MRS. LEROY CLARK, Englewood, N. J.

GRADY CLAY, Louisville, Ky.

WILLIAM M. COTTON, Dayton, O.

E. J. CONDON, Chicago, Ill.

STUART W. CRAMER, Jr., Charlotte, N. C.

JOHN S. DETLIE, Seattle, Wash.

MALCOLM H. DILL, Towson, Md.

MYRON D. DOWNS, Cincinnati, Ohio

CHARLES W. ELIOT 2d, Cambridge, Mass.

HOWARD T. FISHER, Chicago, Ill.

MRS. PAUL GALLAGHER, Omaha, Neb.

MRS. GEORGE A. GARRETT, Washington, D. C.

S. HERBERT HARE, Kansas City, Mo.

BYRON HARVEY, JR., Chicago, Ill.

MRS. E. NEWLANDS JOHNSTON, Washington, D. C.

KARL KAMRATH, Houston, Texas

HAROLD M. LEWIS, New York, N. Y.

JOHN GAW MEEM, Santa Fe, N. M.

HOWARD K. MENHINICK, Atlanta, Ga.

DELESSEPS S. MORRISON, New Orleans, La.

CLYDE NICHOLS, Jr., Kansas City, Mo.

C. MCKIM NORTON, New York, N. Y.

CHARLES F. PALMER, Atlanta, Ga.

JOSEPH PRENDERGAST, New York, N. Y.

LAURANCE S. ROCKEFELLER, New York, N. Y.

J. WOODALL RODGERS, Dallas, Texas.

ARTHUR RUBLOFF, Chicago, Ill.

C. MELVIN SHARPE, Washington, D. C.

JAMES F. SULZBY, Jr., Birmingham, Ala.

FRED W. TUEMMLER, Hyattsville, Md.

C. EDGAR VAN CLEEF, Jr., Oklahoma City, Okla.

SAMUEL P. WETHERILL, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

CARL I. WHEAT, Menlo Park, Calif.

GORDON WHITNALL, Los Angeles, Calif.

H. O. WHITEMORE, Ann Arbor, Mich.

SAM B. ZISMAN, San Antonio, Texas

The purpose of the AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION is the education of the American people to an understanding and appreciation of local, state, regional and national planning for the best use of urban and rural land, and of water and other natural resources; the safeguarding and planned use of local and national parks; the conservation of natural scenery; the improvement of living conditions and the fostering of wider educational facilities in schools and colleges in the fields of planning and conservation.

KANSAS CITY (MO.) PUBLIC LIBRARY

Ref.

6706217

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON STATE PARKS

OFFICERS AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS

TOM WALLACE, Kentucky, *Chairman of the Board*
KENNETH R. COUGILL, Indiana, *President*
ARTHUR C. ELMER, Michigan, *Vice-President*
BEN H. THOMPSON, D. C., *Vice-President*
C. F. JACOBSEN, D. C., *Treasurer*
HARLEAN JAMES, D. C., *Executive Secretary*
MRS. DORA A. PADGETT, D. C., *Editor*

HORACE M. ALBRIGHT, New York	JOSEPH F. KAYLOR, Maryland
ERNEST E. ALLEN, OKLAHOMA	HAROLD W. LATHROP, Colorado
C. H. ARMSTRONG, Oregon	PERRY H. MERRILL, Vermont
HOWARD W. BAKER, Nebraska	RAYMOND R. MITCHELL, Iowa
DR. LAURIE D. COX, New Hampshire	THOMAS W. MORSE, North Carolina
CHARLES A. DeTURK, Washington	A. NEWTON MOYE, Georgia
HAROLD J. DYER, Maine	FRANK D. QUINN, Texas
JAMES F. EVANS, New York	LEWIS G. SCOGGIN, Florida
V. W. FLICKINGER, Ohio	JAMES L. SEGREST, Alabama
EARL P. HANSON, California	JOHN R. VANDERZICHT, Washington
WILLIAM M. HAYS, Georgia	HAROLD S. WAGNER, Ohio
U. W. HELLA, Minnesota	HENRY WARD, D. C.
CLINTON G. JOHNSON, Kentucky	WILLIAM W. WELLS, Louisiana
CONRAD L. WIRTH, D. C.	

The purpose of the NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON STATE PARKS is to inform the public through a central clearing house of information, publications, conferences and by other educational means, of the value of state parks, monuments, historic sites and other types of areas suitable for recreation, study of history and cultural resources through establishment and operation of well balanced state park systems, to the end that every citizen of the United States shall have easy access to state recreation areas and appreciate their value; and to encourage adequate state park agencies and programs, including the establishment of civil service policies and standards of selection, development and administration.

The two organizations join in the publication of the
AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ANNUAL
and the
QUARTERLY, PLANNING AND CIVIC COMMENT

CONTENTS

Frontispiece	PAGE
Preface	ix

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND LOCAL PLANNING

The Report of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	<i>Meyer Kestnbaum</i>	1
The Role of the Federal Government	<i>J. S. Bragdon</i>	5
Planning in the Metropolitan Area and Federal Assistance	<i>Joseph S. Clark, Jr.</i>	12
Federal Relationship to Local Planning	<i>C. McKim Norton</i>	18
Federal Relationship to State Planning	<i>Francis A. Pitkin</i>	19
The Federal Government and the County	<i>Malcolm H. Dill</i>	26
The Future of Metropolitan Regional Planning	<i>Frederick Gulheim</i>	33
The Role of New York State in Urban Renewal	<i>Joseph P. McMurray</i>	37
Federal Aid to Local Government	<i>David L. Lawrence</i>	44
Urban Renewal and Local Planning	<i>James W. Follin</i>	49
Urban Planning Assistance	<i>Tracy B. Augur</i>	50
Commercial and Industrial Redevelopment	<i>Max Wehrly</i>	54
Urban Redevelopment and the Economic Base	<i>William L. C. Wheaton</i>	57
Area Development Programs	<i>Victor Roterus</i>	58
Can We Afford Open Spaces in Metropolitan Areas?	<i>Fred W. Tuemmler</i>	60
Open Spaces and Our Exploding Cities	<i>Joseph Prendergast</i>	69
Planning Ahead for Open Spaces	<i>Herbert H. Smith</i>	72
Stream Pollution	<i>Mark D. Hollis</i>	73
Federal Water Policy	<i>Melvin E. Scheidt</i>	75
Planning Assistance to Flood-Damaged Communities in Connecticut	<i>Frederick P. Clark</i>	84
Discussion	<i>Jean R. Packard</i>	87
Panel on Highways and Community Life	<i>Carl Feiss</i>	88
	<i>Edmund N. Bacon</i>	89
	<i>David R. Levin</i>	91
	<i>Mrs. Cyril G. Fox</i>	92
	<i>Harold Taubin</i>	93

STATE PARKS PROGRAM

Story of Grand Teton National Park	<i>Conrad L. Wirth</i>	97
Integration of Outdoor Forest Recreational Potentials with Public Park Programs	<i>C. J. Olsen</i>	106
Ohio's Experience in Establishing a State Park within a State Forest	<i>V. W. Flickinger</i>	112
Integration of Outdoor Forest Recreational Potentials with Public Park Programs	<i>Ben H. Thompson</i>	117
Recreation Needs in the Public Lands States	<i>J. W. Penfold</i>	121
Roll Call of the States		
Alabama	<i>James L. Segrest</i>	129

	Page
Roll Call of the States, continued	
Arizona	Mrs. Loraine L. Detterbeck 130
California	Earl P. Hanson 130
Colorado	J. K. V. Wager 132
Indiana	K. R. Cougill 133
Iowa	Wilbur A. Rush 135
Kansas	Ernest E. Allen 137
Kentucky	Mrs. Ben Kilgore 137
Otter Creek Park	Clinton G. Johnson 138
Louisiana	William W. Wells 139
Maine	Harold J. Dyer 140
Maryland	Joseph F. Kaylor 140
Michigan	Arthur C. Elmer 142
Minnesota	U. W. Hella 143
Missouri	Joseph Jaeger, Jr. 144
Montana	Ashley C. Roberts 145
Nebraska	Jack D. Strain 146
New Hampshire	Russell B. Tobey 147
New York	James F. Evans 148
Ohio	V. W. Flickinger 150
Ohio Historical Society	Richard S. Fatig 152
Oklahoma	Ernest E. Allen 153
Oregon	C. H. Armstrong 153
Pennsylvania	W. P. Moll 154
Tennessee	Gordon H. Turner 156
Texas	Frank D. Quinn 157
West Virginia	Kermil McKeever 158

Preface

THE AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ANNUAL for 1956 presents the addresses delivered at the National Citizens Planning Conference on Federal Government and Local Planning, sponsored by the American Planning and Civic Association, and held in Washington February 5-9, 1956, and the addresses delivered at the 26th Annual Meeting of the National Conference on State Parks, held in the Grand Teton Mountain National Park, September 7-11, 1956, including the Roll Call of the States.

The National Citizens Planning Conference presented a session on "Thirty Years of Planning in the Federal City, and a Look into the Future," at which Charles W. Eliot 2d and John Nolen, Jr. received citations for service to the Federal City, and John T. Howard delivered a notable address on "A Planner's Philosophy for the National Capital Region." All of this material was presented in full in *PLANNING AND CIVIC COMMENT* and therefore will not be repeated in this *ANNUAL*.

It was on this occasion also that the American Planning and Civic Association cooperated with the American Automobile Association in attending the *Pioneer Dinner*, at which the National Park Service's Program for Mission 66 was launched. This program has also been presented in *PLANNING AND CIVIC COMMENT*.

At the Planning Conference Mr. Raymond H. Wittcoff, Chairman of the National Citizens Committee for Educational Television, gave a lecture on "Use of Mass Media to Educate for Better Planning." Because of its timeliness this address was also presented in *PLANNING AND CIVIC COMMENT*, as was the Zoning Round Table.

For the National Citizens Planning Conference, the Hosts were: American Institute of Planners, Washington Chapter; American Society of Landscape Architects, Potomac Chapter; Arlington County Office of Planning; Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce; Committee of 100 on the Federal City, American Planning and Civic Association; District of Columbia Commissioners; District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency; Fairfax County Planning Commission; Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; Housing and Home Finance Agency; Loudon County Planning Commission; Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission; National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, Potomac Chapter; National Capital Housing Authority; National Capital Regional Planning Council; National Capital Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; National Park Service, Department of the Interior; National

Trust for Historic Preservation; Northern Virginia Regional Planning and Economic Development Commission; Office of Area Development, Business and Defense Services Administration, Department of Commerce; Rockville Planning Advisory Commission; Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture; Upper Montgomery County Planning Commission; Washington Board of Trade; Washington Building Congress, Inc.; Washington Clearing House; Washington Housing Association.

The Program Committee consisted of Carl Feiss, Chairman; Frederick Gutheim, Ronald F. Lee, Flavel Shurtleff and Ben H. Thompson, with General Grant and Harlean James *ex officio*.

Two of the addresses delivered at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference on State Parks were published in **PLANNING AND CIVIC COMMENT**,—one was on “The Evolving National Recreation Pattern,” by Joseph Prendergast, Director, National Recreation Association, and the other described Public Parks on Private Property—“Tree Farm Recreation—A Sustained Yield of Enjoyment on Industrial Forest Lands,” by Frederick Billings, Public Recreation Administrator, Weyerhaeuser Timber Company.

The address of Ben H. Thompson on Integration of Outdoor Forest Recreation Potentials with Public Park Programs was delivered at the National Citizens Planning Conference, but is presented here with the State Parks Program, because of other related addresses.

The Program Committee for the National Conference consisted of: Harold Lathrop, Chairman, John R. Vanderzicht, J. V. K. Wagar, Jack F. Lewis, Chester H. Armstrong, Howard W. Baker, V. W. Flickinger, and Harlean James.

These 1956 meetings presented programs of unusual excellence and many addresses of permanent value.

HARLEAN JAMES, Editor

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND LOCAL PLANNING

PAPERS PRESENTED AT THE FIFTY-SECOND ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION, THE NATIONAL CITIZENS PLANNING CONFERENCE ON FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND LOCAL PLANNING, HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 5-8, 1956.

The Report of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

HON. MEYER KESTNBAUM, Chairman

AFTER 168 years the American Federal system is still one of the most impressive experiments in the art of government ever undertaken. The central problem remains today as in 1787; how to combine national strength with local freedom and initiative. The continuing element of experiment lies in the necessity of adopting the system constantly to changing conditions of the modern world.

The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, appointed in 1953, is the first official body to make an intensive study of the central feature of Federalism; the relations between the National Government and the States and their political subdivisions.

The Commission was directed "to study the proper role of the Federal Government in relation to the States and their political subdivisions" with a view to recommending proper allocations of responsibilities in the light of the fiscal and other capacities of the several levels of government. The Commission urged upon the National Government the need for greater restraint in entering new fields or in expanding activities in areas traditionally within the scope of state and local governments. The Commission recommended the establishment in the Executive Office of the President of a modest staff agency directed to pay continuing attention to problems in this field. It is also recommended that, in dealing with States and their subdivisions, the National Government should minimize controls of other arrangements that tend to curtail their autonomy or freedom of action and should act affirmatively to enhance their role.

On the other hand, the Commission found an urgent need for action on the part of the States to increase their own capacity for meeting the needs of modern government. Specifically, it found a widespread need for modernization of state constitutions, better apportionment of state legislatures, more efficient organization of state administrations, better balanced state and local tax structures, and extension of a greater amount of home rule to properly organized county and municipal governments.

The Commission's recommendations on the future course of intergovernmental relations flow logically from its study of the history of

the division of powers between the Nation and the States. The Commission found confirmation for the belief that despite great changes in the world, our Federal system is sound and flexible enough to serve the country indefinitely.

The importance of state and local government was underscored by the fact that the normal peacetime activities of these governments have been expanding more rapidly than those of the National Government. In the words of the report: "The preservation and strengthening of our Federal system depend in the last analysis on the self-restraint and responsibility, as well as the wisdom, of our actions as citizens."

The report points out that the Federal principle may be undermined or lost either by overuse or misuse of national authority or by nonuse of state and local authority. Overuse or misuse of national authority can be avoided by exercising restraint and wisdom. Nonuse and consequent erosion of state and local authority can best be avoided by making state and local governments so effective that they are able to respond to needs at least as promptly as the national government.

It appeared from the Commission's studies that some weaknesses at the state level result from failure to apply fundamental principles of our American system of government: (1) all constitutions ought, like the Constitution of the United States, to deal with fundamentals and not with the details of governmental organization and power; (2) legislative bodies should be fairly representative of the people as a whole so that every important segment of the community can be heard in the making of public policy; (3) the executive branch should be so organized that the Chief Executive can be held responsible for the way the laws are executed and services performed; and (4) so far as possible, self-government should be extended to the people in their local communities.

The Commission was particularly concerned over the results of widespread under-representation of urban communities in state legislatures. It concluded that legislative neglect of these communities has been an important factor in leading "more and more people to look to Washington for more and more of the services and controls they desire." There is reason to believe that this trend will continue until many States take energetic action to readjust legislative representation to the current distribution of population. The Commission pointed out that "the same shift of population which has resulted in state legislatures becoming less representative of urban areas has had the effect of making the United States Senate more representative of these areas, because Senators, elected at large, must depend heavily upon urban voters, even in predominantly rural States."

The Commission found that it could not appraise Federal-state relations and the feasibility of increased state responsibility without looking rather carefully at state-local relations and the structure of

local government. Many of the important responsibilities that are constitutionally vested in the States are, or can best be, discharged by local governments. Many of the complexities in intergovernmental relationships stem from the fact that many of the 109,000 separate local governmental units in the United States, have neither the size, the resources, nor the legal powers needed for effective self-government. Some of the more pressing demands for Federal aid can be traced to the inability of the existing units of local government to conduct or finance important services without outside direction and assistance—which they are not obtaining from their own States. This is especially true in metropolitan areas, described by the Commission's Advisory Committee on Local Government as "the most important focal points for intergovernmental relations."

As for the special problems of metropolitan areas, the Commission observed: "The time is long overdue for an intensive nationwide study of governmental areas with special attention to metropolitan communities. The study should engage the cooperation of National, state and local governments, as well as universities, private foundations, and civic agencies. Political invention in this field is greatly needed."

The Commission's studies of civil defense and urban vulnerability and of housing and urban renewal revealed the urgent need for better planning and more effective coordination of governmental activities in metropolitan areas. The Commission specifically recommended "that States and municipalities give increased attention to unifying their community services through the creation of metropolitan planning authorities to deal with problems related to urban affairs" and urged the States to provide financial and technical assistance wherever necessary. More effective metropolitan area planning backed up by better organization of governments in metropolitan areas would simplify Federal state-local relations and cooperative arrangements.

The Commission noted a revival of county government and an increasing recognition of its importance, both in rural and in metropolitan areas. It pointed out that the county is commonly used as a basis for administering a number of important Federal programs. At the same time, municipal-type functions are being transferred to many counties from municipalities with inadequate area and resources. The conclusion was reached that modernization and strengthening of county government would advance the cause of self-government and "take some of the load off state administration and simplify the task as administering National programs based upon the counties."

The Commission recognized the inevitably depressing effect of the current high level of Federal taxation upon the fiscal capacities of state and local governments. Substantial reduction in the level of Federal taxation and expenditures could do more for the fiscal capacity of state

and local governments than anything else. And in such a reduction lies the best chance of reducing tax overlapping, since it would then be possible to consider the full repeal of certain taxes.

One of the Commission's most detailed studies was made by the Study Committee on Payments in Lieu of Taxes and Shared Revenues. The Commission recognized that tax immunity of Federal property has weakened many local governments. The Study Committee's report was offered as a basis upon which Congress may "build a sound program of payments in lieu of taxes on Federal properties and make such adjustments in shared revenue arrangements as may be needed." At the same time, the Commission called attention to the need for comparable state payments for the benefit of municipalities and counties.

The Commission expressed the opinion that "each State should undertake a searching reappraisal of its fiscal policies, including the constitutional and statutory limitations on its taxation and borrowing activities, the limitations on the fiscal powers of local governments, the system of property tax administration, and the financial aids it is providing its subdivisions."

The Commission unanimously accepted a statement on the principles that should be observed in allocating governmental activities and responsibilities: "Assuming efficient and responsible government at all levels—National, state and local—we should seek to divide our civic responsibilities so that we—

"Leave to private initiative all the functions that citizens can perform privately; use the level of government closest to the community for all public functions it can handle; utilize cooperative intergovernmental arrangements where appropriate to attain economical performance and popular approval; reserve National action for residual participation where state and local governments are not fully adequate, and for the continuing responsibilities that only the National government can undertake."

The Commission was impressed by the virtually universal approbation accorded to the great variety of services-in-aid, including much technical and professional assistance, that pass between the National Government and the state and local governments. This type of cooperative Federalism has helped States, counties and municipalities to do better and more effective jobs in law enforcement, milk inspection, building codes, personnel training, and scores of other activities. The Commission agreed with its Advisory Committee on Local Government that more emphasis should be put on many services-in-aid.

Although grants-in-aid bear some resemblances to services-in-aid they differ from them in important ways and raise important policy questions to which the Commission devoted a great deal of time. The Commission studies grants-in-aid to see how they can be limited to legitimate National objectives and handled so as to strengthen rather than weaken state and local government. In determining whether or not a grant-in-aid is the best approach to a given objective, it is necessary

to compare it with direct National action on the one hand and with any other possible form of national-state cooperation on the other. While there are situations where direct National action is to be preferred, the Commission tended to favor the grant-in-aid over "a direct National program, which would give the States no role whatsoever."

In the long run the value of the work of the Commission will depend less upon the extent to which its recommendations on grants are carried out than upon the extent to which citizens and policy makers and administrators at all levels of government apply the basic principles enunciated in the report and use the standards, guidelines, and procedures suggested for the future management of intergovernmental relationships.

Role of the Federal Government

MAJOR GENERAL J. S. BRAGDON, Special Assistant to the President of the United States, Washington, D. C.

IT IS with a deep personal interest that I come to speak at this Conference. Planning ahead, in some form or another, has been part of most of my assignments. It is essential for a major project, for sound development and for stable growth, that we prepare for them rather than wait until we are forced to act by the pressure of the immediate necessities of the day.

Planning for the future often will concern not only our own organization or community, but our neighbors and many others as well. That is why it is important that planning for public services be done in cooperation with other units of government or groups which may be affected by it.

We have just heard a summary of the findings of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. All of us, I believe, will subscribe without reservation to the Commission's guiding principles on the division of civic responsibilities: To use the level of government closest to the community for all public functions it can handle, and to reserve national action for those areas where state and local governments are not fully adequate.

The program for this conference referred to the growing interest on the part of the Federal Government in the physical development of localities. As public service responsibilities have expanded and as the task of government has grown, the Federal Government has been called upon to assume new obligations and enter into more partnership relations with state and local governments.

This holds true particularly in regard to the preservation and development of our natural assets and of the construction of public facilities to serve the vital needs of our expanding population.

We are presently experiencing one of the most spectacular developments in our Nation's history. Some 15 or 20 years ago experts predicted that our population growth would soon slow down, and that further increases, at best, would be modest. That crystal ball was somewhat clouded. During the 1940's our population grew by 19 million, the greatest increase in any ten-year period; the 1950's will add another 27 million people. This means that, during the short span of 20 years—between 1940 and 1960—the population of the United States will expand by more than one-third of the number which it had taken more than 300 years to acquire. There is no sign of a flattening out of the curve for a long time to come. Almost three children are born for every person who dies.

This unprecedented growth is a living testimony to the continued vitality and to the future potential of our Nation. We are blessed with plenty of space and abundant natural resources to afford the American people and all the additional millions yet to come, more of the material goods of life than ever before or than any country in the history of man. It is gratifying and reassuring to know that our economy and our living standards are expanding even faster than our population. There is an abundance of most of the goods and services which are supplied from private sources; more food, more clothing, more automobiles and more of many other things which serve to make life more pleasant. Our retail stores are full of merchandise for all. All of this is in contrast to many other less fortunate areas of the world.

To be sure, we are by no means free from shortages. Many of these shortages exist in services and facilities which are commonly supplied by government. Our road system is choked by more cars than it can handle; our schools are overcrowded; our supply of clean water is inadequate in many areas; our waste disposal systems do not meet the demands made upon them; our hospitals are short many thousands of beds; our airports are hard pressed to accommodate the steadily growing number of flights.

We may ask: What accounts for this inadequacy of public facilities amidst an economy of abundance? How did this come about?

The main reason probably is that the past 25 years have been characterized by a succession of depression, war and material shortages which discouraged the construction of community facilities. After the war, major capital outlay projects often were postponed in the expectation that costs which had more than doubled would decline. Many communities felt it wise to delay expanded public construction until a downturn in the economy and rising unemployment would make the timing more appropriate. But the downturn in prices or in economic activity never came. Thanks to skillful guidance by a balanced economic philosophy we are now experiencing the greatest prosperity this country

has ever known. It is useless to wait for lower costs, and it is—we all hope—futile to wait for another depression.

The construction of public works has also been delayed because the essential requirements of our national security programs and the concomitant heavy tax burden have severely strained the ability of the American people to increase other public services at a more rapid pace. Defense-connected expenditures which required less than 4 percent of the national income in pre-war days have in recent years claimed between 16 percent and 20 percent of our income.

This made it more difficult, particularly for state and local governments to increase taxes and debts for domestic purposes. These and other influences—more or less related to events of national scope—combined to keep public works construction below the level required to meet vital needs.

More recently public works activity has been expanding rapidly; it established new peace-time records in each of the past five years, and reached \$12 billion in 1955. About one-fourth of the total is direct Federal construction for defense facilities, natural resources developments, and for public buildings and service facilities.

Almost three-fourths of all public works activity—over \$9 billion in 1955—is by State and local governments for roads, schools, hospitals, water and sewerage systems, and public service facilities. These governments provide about 90 percent of the costs under their own power; about 10 percent comes from Federal grants-in-aid.

Estimates of the accumulated need and the future requirements for public works vary greatly because of widely differing concepts of “need” and desirable standards. Public construction requirements over the next decade have been placed at \$200 billion and even as high as \$300 billion. Regardless of what may be real “need” and what may be only “desirable,” there is widespread agreement that the pace of public works construction should be stepped up if acceptable standards of public service are to be available throughout the nation.

Because of the magnitude of the task, the Federal Government has been assisting state and local governments in the planning and financing of public construction on an increasing scale. Comprehensive, long-range planning is necessary to measure our needs; to establish their relative urgencies; to determine if and to what extent Federal assistance is called for; and to find means for preventing emergencies instead of waiting to deal with them when they are upon us. Public works are costly and expected to serve for many years—or for generations—and should not be built at the spur of the moment. Since the needs are patently vast, and means will always be limited, we must plan how and where we can best use our resources.

For some years there have been suggestions that the planning of public works be coordinated in the Executive Office of the President.

Two years ago the Council of Economic Advisers first created a Public Works Planning Unit. To give the planning work added emphasis and enlarge its scope, the President, in August of 1955 transferred the Unit to the White House Office and established the staff post of Special Assistant for Public Works Planning.

The Public Works Planning Unit is purely advisory. Its first duty is to gather and transmit to the President and to other staff agencies information on the magnitude, type and relative urgency of public works needs, on the extent of short-range and long-range works planning and programming among Federal agencies and State and local governments and to submit recommendations for desirable Federal action. The Unit has three major goals: FIRST, that the volume of public works be adequate to serve the public needs; SECOND, that public works be efficiently planned and economically executed; and THIRD, that public works construction be arranged so far as practicable to assist in the stabilization of industry and employment through the proper timing of such construction.

An Advisory Committee consisting of representatives of Federal agencies concerned with construction or with grants-in-aid for public works has been active for some time. A similar Advisory Committee consisting largely of State and local public officials and concerned with State and local public works will soon be established. Further, we are eager to receive advice and suggestions from State and local officials and from civic organizations on ways and means of advancing the planning of public works construction.

Last year a survey was undertaken of the public works plans of the 48 State governments and the 4000 largest cities, counties and school districts. It revealed the existence of plans in various stages of readiness for more than 71,000 projects for a total value of \$28 billion. This is very encouraging. We expect to repeat this survey later this year and establish it on an annual basis.

While we all expect that the level of economic activity will remain high, insurance for the continuance of general prosperity is a wise safeguard. The Employment Act of 1946 made it a continuing responsibility of the Federal Government "to promote maximum employment, production and purchasing power." Part of a program for effective action to combat a downturn in the economy and shore-up flagging employment, is a sufficient reservoir of plans for needed public works whose construction can readily be started.

Several programs are now in effect which aim to stimulate the preparation of advance plans for public works by State and local governments; others have been proposed by the President. You will hear more about some of these programs during this conference. I would like to mention some of the more important programs for the assistance of local planning.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency makes interest-free advances to municipalities for the cost of plans—including engineering and architectural surveys—for the construction of public works. Advances are made only for projects which conform to an over-all State, local or regional plan, approved by the appropriate local authority. The program aims to encourage local units of government to establish and maintain at all times a reserve of planned public works whose construction could be rapidly started. A revolving fund of up to 48 million dollars has been authorized for this purpose.

The HHFA also makes loans to States, municipalities and other units of government or purchases their securities to finance the cost of essential community facilities. \$100 million have been authorized for this purpose.

More than 90 percent of the cities over 25,000 population now have the service of a planning agency, be it a planning commission, department or division. But many smaller cities have no planning organization.

Unfortunately, planning often stops at the city's boundaries. We all know, of course, that planning should be undertaken on an area-basis—including particularly those densely populated sections adjacent to cities which require municipal-type public services. The latest census reports show that more than 97 percent of the population growth between 1950 and 1955 lay in the 168 standard metropolitan areas. In many metropolitan areas several dozens or even hundreds of independent governmental units are operating simultaneously with jurisdictional boundaries often cutting across natural service or communications lines. Metropolitan planning, badly needed as it is, is making only slow progress.

Two programs of Urban Planning Assistance are now operative:

The HHFA makes grants on a matching basis to State planning agencies to aid them in providing planning assistance to municipalities having a population of less than 25,000. The Administrator is also empowered to make Urban Planning Grants on a matching basis to official State, metropolitan or regional planning agencies for urban planning work covering larger areas or regions. \$5 million is presently authorized for this program.

Urban Renewal is still another program of the HHFA. It aims not only at slum clearance but also at preventing the creation of slums and at removing the causes of urban blight.

Slums are the result of long years of civic neglect. They have spread far and become a problem of national scope. It would not be appropriate for the Federal Government to relieve a community of its duty and thus to enable it to shift its responsibility to others. "However, Federal assistance is justified," said President Eisenhower, "for communities which face up to the problem of neighborhood decay and undertake long-range programs directed to its prevention." Assistance is now provided

by planning advances, loans, capital grants and other methods. One billion dollars in contract authorizations have been made available for this program by the Housing Act of 1954 and its amendment in 1955.

The fundamental philosophy of this program—and in fact of all programs of Federal assistance to States and local governments—is to help communities to help themselves. The Federal government does not aim to substitute its own action for local action, but to encourage, strengthen and supplement the efforts of States and communities.

This principle underlies the program for Federal aid to school construction which President Eisenhower submitted three weeks ago. He proposed Federal matching grants of \$20 million for the cost of the planning of State programs designed to increase school construction, and \$2 billion in Federal funds toward the cost of school construction projects and for the purchase of local school bonds. These funds would be granted upon submission of and conformance with a state plan. The enactment of this proposal would undoubtedly stimulate the planning of school building programs. This would parallel the effect of the grant-in-aid programs for hospital construction and airport construction which conditioned the approval of project grants upon conformance with a general plan.

Several States and communities have indicated that they would find it easier to draft long-range plans if Federal policies in regard to form and extent of cooperative programs were more definite and predictable. You all are aware of the fact that no Congress can bind a succeeding Congress and that appropriations cannot be foretold with certainty. However, the present Administration has attempted to establish long-range policies in several areas which would give State and local governments and other affected parties greater assurance that they could plan for longer periods.

This aim, of establishing long-range policies also was the purpose of the creation of the President's Water Resources Policy Committee. That Committee, as you probably know, has rendered its report. Since Water Policy affects the plans of many communities, I would like to give you a quick review of that report.

This report represents agreements by the Federal agencies in this field on many of the points of differences in practices and procedures of the past, and at the same time provides for a planning organization which will furnish continuing mechanisms for settling unresolved problems that still exist or which may arise and for formulation of guiding policies where needed.

The report provides for uniformity in the methods of authorization of projects among the agencies, uniformity in the methods of evaluating projects, and uniformity in the methods of determining cost-sharing.

The report states that the principles that recognize water rights as property rights should be accepted, and that determination as to dis-

position of water should recognize such rights. It also recommends that a study be made under the leadership of the Federal Government in collaboration with the States and local entities to determine the principles and criteria that should be incorporated in both Federal and local laws upon which rights to the appropriation and use of water may be established. These provisions are of high importance to the Western States at this time and as our uses of water increase with the supply remaining the same, they will become of great significance in the East.

Organizationally, the report recommends the creation of basin committees composed of local interests, as well as Federal, to develop and keep current comprehensive plans for river basins; for an independent Board of Review to avoid uneconomical and infeasible projects; and for a Coordinator continuously to develop criteria for guidance in the planning of projects.

The PACWRP Report reflects the same philosophy of government as other programs of the Eisenhower Administration; emphasis upon local autonomy and self-determination, a deep respect for the role of States and local governments in our Federal system, and the firm conviction that authority and responsibility must go hand in hand. Many of our present complications in the field of water resources, of planning for public facilities and in other areas could be avoided if ours were a unitary system of government. All responsibility and all power would then be vested in the National Government. But this would be contrary to the principle which has guided our Nation since the inception of the Republic; that the enduring strength of our system of government lies in a wide dispersal of power. The power to make decisions on local matters is better and more safely located in the States and in ten thousands of communities than in one central government.

The real driving power for the planning of better communities must come from millions of citizens all over the country who want to make their city a better place to live in, for themselves and for their children. Their enthusiasm, their appeal to civic pride, can and will overcome local inertia wherever it exists, and spark action. There is no substitute for local initiative.

That does not necessarily mean that each community should just tend to its own yard. Our various units- and levels-of governments should not all be going their own way. Neither should they be competitors for authority. All governments were established to serve the people. We all can learn from each other's experiences and benefit from working together. I can assure you that this Administration now and always stands ready to join in common purpose with States, with communities and with civic groups. Together we can achieve through planning and construction of needed public assets the goal of finer communities which American hard work and enterprise merit.

Planning in the Metropolitan Area and Federal Assistance—Keynote Address

JOSEPH S. CLARK, JR., Mayor of Philadelphia, 1952-1956.

FOR years I have been wondering what a keynote address was supposed to be. Listening to the speakers at those three-ring circuses, our quadrennial Party Political Conventions has provided little enlightenment. And now I find I must make a keynote address myself.

Turning to Webster's Dictionary for enlightenment, I find that "keynote" is defined as "the ruling principle, as, for example, the keynote of her costume was simplicity." The picture created in the mind of a happily married, middle-aged man by this stark realism, is one I should not care to share with my audience.

Keynote is also defined as a "tonic," so perhaps my job here today is to perform the function of a tonic by stimulating some thinking on the subject of planning in the metropolitan area, and Federal assistance.

I have been muttering to myself on this subject for some little time. A year and a half ago I suggested to the annual meeting of the American Society for Planning Officials that the future of metropolitan, and therefore of urban government lay in the hands of the planner. Far from being visionaries and dreamers, planners, in my judgment, are the stark realists of our social thinking.

Speaking bluntly we must find quickly a solution to metropolitan area governmental problems. We must find practical ways of forming or expanding political units with adequate authority to deal with social, economic, and political problems on an urban basis.

Shelter, transportation, water supply, sewage disposal, education, civil defense, recreation, health and welfare, are merely a few of the problems pressing for solution in every metropolitan area in the United States today. And almost without exception we do not have political units large enough, or with enough authority, to find and provide answers which are sufficiently comprehensive and feasible.

It is later than we think. These regional problems are already overwhelming us. The logic and the need for new political methods of attack are inescapable and generally realized by groups like ourselves. But how many city councilmen, how many state legislators, indeed, how many congressmen, are prepared to take the necessary steps to move the problem forward to solution? And indeed can we expect them to move until there is a far greater public understanding of these problems than presently exists.

We have no lack of authoritative texts. You have just had the privilege of listening to Mr. Meyer Kestnbaum, distinguished chairman of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Last June that Commission said:

The time is long overdue for an intensive nation-wide study of governmental areas with special attention to metropolitan communities. The study should engage the cooperation of national, state and local governments, as well as universities, private foundations, and civic agencies. Political invention in this field is greatly needed.

Let me repeat, and underline, the last sentence: *Political invention in this field is greatly needed.*

The task force Advisory Committee on Local Government of Mr. Kestnbaum's Commission was even more specific. Chaired by the former Governor of Louisiana, Sam H. Jones, it stated:

The metropolitan areas of the United States are the most important focal points for intergovernmental relations. Just as the importance of a railroad center or an air terminal is determined by the number of lines running into it and the number of passengers carried, so also are the metropolitan areas of primary concern as the places where great numbers of governments, people, and industries, come together. . . . The people and the governments of the metropolitan areas cannot solve their problems with the governmental and private devices now available.

Let me approach the subject somewhat more specifically with examples from the only area I know much about first-hand: the Greater Philadelphia-Delaware Valley metropolitan area.

Last year the *Philadelphia Inquirer* sent one of its star reporters, C. Allen Keith, to work on a series of articles entitled "Philadelphia: Problems and Progress." Let me just give you the headlines in order. I suspect they will be reminiscent of your own problems at home.

City's Rebirth: A Billion in New Projects; Taxpayers Carry Burden of Improvements and Rising Costs; Philadelphia is Heart of Metropolitan Area; Trend to Suburbs; Nearby Counties Gain in Business Activity; Some Industry Goes to Greener Pastures; Housing Units Built in Philadelphia Metropolitan Area During Last Five Years; City Faces Massive Highway Building Job; The Traffic Problem; Ninety Thousand Enter Mid-City Each Day—And They Bring 277,000 Vehicles.

And then the melancholy and inevitable finale: "Philadelphia Looks to State and U. S. for Funds."

You are probably used to hearing mayors repeat over and over again:

With the Federal government taking seventy-five cents out of every tax dollar, and the State taking another thirteen, how can you expect our city to raise the money necessary to keep it a civilized place to live in?

For four years as Mayor of Philadelphia, I came to Washington with a tin cup in my hand. Each year a not altogether unfeeling National Government put something in the cup. It never seemed to me enough, but at least it helped keep us going. Now I suggest with Mr. Kestnbaum and Governor Jones we should think through the respective roles of local, state, and Federal government, and indeed, of private industry, in the solution of our metropolitan area planning problem.

Let me illustrate from three critical fields: housing, traffic, and water resources.

One, Housing: We in Philadelphia were laggards in the housing field. In the late thirties our City government turned down \$19,000,000 of proffered Federal funds for public housing on the grounds that we would have no part in creeping socialism—a view, I am happy to say, never shared by the late Senator Robert A. Taft. Parenthetically it should be noted that we also refused Public Works Administration assistance which might have built the sewage disposal plants we are now bringing to a belated completion at heavy expense to our local taxpayers.

After World War II, however, we came out of the Middle Ages, and since that time our Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority, and our Philadelphia Housing Authority, have been active feeders at the Federal trough.

We were among the first of the large cities to get our workable redevelopment renewal plan approved by the Federal authorities. Our Housing Coordinator, William F. Rafsky, has done yeoman work in bringing together various public and private agencies within the city charged with the job of providing shelter for over two million people.

But as he put it to me the other day:

To plan for meeting shelter needs within our metropolitan area governmental boundaries is like trying to plan in the "room of mirrors" at the amusement park "fun house," where distortion is the normal pattern.

Land use is basic in all planning. And desirable distribution of land among competing and frequently irreconcilable uses can be met only on a regional basis. To throw together all land uses within present political boundaries inevitably results in something approaching chaos in the region.

We just have to be able to plan land use for the whole metropolitan area if our whole urban civilization is not to fall on its face. And if I may coin a bitter cliché, we must do something about the ostriches in the azalea belt. Somehow, some way, we must carry home to the people who earn their livelihood directly or indirectly from the central city that they, too, have a vital stake in a metropolitan area solution of the problems their move to the suburbs has helped to create.

Nor are all the troubles those of the big city. Hatboro, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, a pleasant country village in my boyhood, now a thriving and expanding suburban community with a number of industries, has recently proposed a four hundred percent increase in real estate assessments to pay for the schools, playgrounds, sewers, and paving its rapid expansion requires.

We thus cannot plan for and get adequate community facilities such as parks, and major recreational areas, if we cannot plan on a regional basis.

Imagine the absurdity of a situation where on one side of a residential Philadelphia street a Montgomery County township has under way a major commercial development which not only makes City Line an inadequate traffic artery, but will in short order eliminate the residential area on the Philadelphia side. And yet absolutely nothing can be done about it on a governmental basis, except for Philadelphia to change its zoning of the area in question.

Nor can we much longer handle our minorities problem within the confines of present city boundaries. At present our 400,000 negroes are concentrated in the first ring around our central city in areas prime for redevelopment. Racial discrimination makes it difficult, and sometimes impossible for negroes to live in suburban areas. Unless something is done soon we will have a permanent center city core in large part negro, while suburbia remains lilywhite. The tragic social consequences of such segregation can quite literally sap the vitality of the entire metropolitan area. For no metropolitan region can be healthy if its core is socially unsound.

Where does the Federal government come into all this you may ask? Quite clearly in the urban redevelopment and public housing fields. The time has come, I think, for a new approach in Federal participation on a regional rather than on a local governmental unit basis. The time has also come, I suggest, for the Federal government to use the great facilities it extends to private building in a way to promote social justice and the principles inherent in the Bill of Rights and the Civil War amendments to the Constitution of the United States. In other words, to deny credit to those who practice racial discrimination in the housing field. This, I submit, is clearly part of Federal assistance to metropolitan area planning.

Secondly, let us turn briefly to traffic and highways. Again we in Philadelphia have not been laggards. Our Urban Traffic and Transportation Board, after two years of hard work, has come up with a Comprehensive Plan for solving the traffic and transportation problems of our metropolitan area. I should like to give you a few quotations from their report, prepared by a Commission, not of starry-eyed public administrators, but of hard-boiled businessmen, each one of whom had a vested interest in the movement of people and goods around and through Philadelphia. I quote:

The nature of the physical inadequacies of transportation in the Philadelphia region are symptoms of one of the basic causes of the problem—the lack of an organizational framework capable of dealing with transportation on a comprehensive basis. The task of providing the region with transportation facilities and services is divided among a host of public and private agencies. These organizations are each limited to a segment of the transportation job (one or more modes, functions, geographical areas, and/or political subdivisions) and operate under differing “ground rules” as to the extent of public control and financial assistance. Compartmented by subdivisions of functions, these agencies are by necessity

restricted to a piecemeal approach to what is essentially a regional problem. . . . The net effect is an uncoordinated, irrational administrative structure incapable of formulating a consistent, dynamic policy for dealing with the transportation requirements of the region.

Responsibilities for highways are divided among numerous state and local government agencies. . . . Although cooperation between these agencies is necessarily close, there is no overall regional highway planning or program.

Lack of coordination is also evident in the design, construction, finance, regulation, and maintenance functions. Complicated and time-consuming negotiations between various highway agencies are necessary before agreed-upon projects are brought to reality.

There is no regional transportation plan or operation. The inconsistencies within each of the foregoing transportation areas are compounded when evaluated from the standpoint of a regional system incorporating all modes of transport. At present, highway planning is being conducted with little regard for present and future mass transportation routes and services. . . . In brief, there is no integrated transportation system.

The Board's basic recommendation was for a Regional Governmental Transportation Agency which would integrate all transportation by road and rail, including subways, buses and trolley cars, on a self-supporting basis, with tolls on highways providing funds necessary to overcome an anticipated deficit from public transportation agencies.

Where, you ask, does the Federal government fit into all this? I am sure you know the answer: it pays most of the bills. Passage of the legislation presently pending in the Congress for many billions of additional dollars of Federal money for the Inter-state Highway System is essential to the future existence of Philadelphia's metropolitan area. We literally will strangle without it.

Let us turn to the third field of water resources. We, in the Delaware Valley, have a melancholy history of failure in our efforts to plan adequate all-purpose use of that magnificent regional asset, the Delaware River. Proper conservation and development of these water and related land resources is again essential to our prosperity and well being. What we need is a comprehensive and multiple purpose use of this water supply on which our very existence depends.

The time came, many years ago, for New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Philadelphia, and New York City, and many of the other communities depending on the Delaware to press for a comprehensive approach to development of the basin. And yet we fell to quarrelling, ended up in the Supreme Court of the United States, and still have no adequate comprehensive plan on which we can all count, under which the economic potentialities of the river basin could be developed with appropriate local, state, and Federal participation.

This is a problem of flood control and hydro-electric power development and water supply and water pollution and recreation and fish and wild life preservation and agricultural and forest land conservation and development, including navigation, irrigation, salinity control and main-

tenance of stream flow. Of course such a plan is well beyond the financial means of any one level of government. Of course such a problem requires joint planning and joint financing by local, state and Federal governments.

And the Federal role must be much greater than it was in the past. What we really need is some kind of River Basin agency which can do for the Delaware what the T.V.A. did for the Tennessee. I do not say the pattern should be followed exactly. I do say that the problem must be solved on a regional basis.

Fortunately we have got this particular show on the road. The Army Engineers are on their way to making for the first time an adequate and comprehensive all-purpose study of the Delaware River. I hope the Congress and the President will give them the money they need to get started. The four States and the two major cities involved have created a Delaware River Basin Survey Commission, on which I have the honor of serving, and which I hope may receive foundation assistance in financing a study which will outline to the respective governors and mayors by June 30, 1958, a workable plan in cooperation with the Federal government to utilize the Delaware River resources on a coordinated and sensible basis.

From these three examples perhaps you will get a little tonic to your thinking on Federal assistance to metropolitan area problems. May I conclude with two warnings.

First, we must not only plan, but we must sell our plans to the people. It does no good for us just to talk to ourselves. We will never get ahead in our democracy until every housewife, and indeed every taxicab driver, and every factory worker knows the meaning of metropolitan area planning and his stake in it for the future. It is not enough to make the snowballs; somebody has to throw them, and until public opinion is sufficiently aroused so the politicians will throw them you are going to have to pitch yourselves. The day is past for planning in an ivory tower. You must get out in the hustings and sell your product.

Second, we must build from the ground up, not from the top down. The Federal government must help, but the Federal government should not dominate. We have seen in the field of housing the deadening hand of a Federal bureaucracy. The planners know what they want, but they cannot quite sell it to the Congress. A compromise law is passed, and the Federal bureaucracy interprets it. Interprets it all too often with red tape and edicts from Washington, conceived on a safety-first basis. If we are to have livable regions in the future, the impetus for not only planning, but execution must come from the local level. Local planning boards must stimulate local civic agencies to continue to evaluate both programs and performance. The Federal government can, and should, lay down the Marquis of Queensberry rules for, after all, it is paying a large part of the piper's bill; but it should never again get into the posi-

tion of dominance which has cast so heavy and so dead a hand on the housing and redevelopment program during the last four years.

The basic success of American democracy lies in the genius of the ordinary citizen. If he does not rise to this challenge to urban survival and carry the ball himself, he will look in vain to Washington for a solution to his predicament.

FEDERAL RELATIONSHIP TO LOCAL PLANNING

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF C. MCKIM NORTON, VICE-PRESIDENT,
REGIONAL PLAN ASSOCIATION, INC.

DURING the next two days we shall be discussing the ways and means and effects of federal services and financial assistance in aid of the improved physical development of communities. It may be worth notice that despite the broad scope of this conference, the field of federal-local relationships is not fully covered. For example, federal aid to education, civil defense and many functional services—I point this out, not in criticism of those who programmed this conference, but to underscore the wide extent and importance of the federal interest and impact on local development.

I hope that when this conference is put into the records there will be a summing up of the Federal-local situation and some policy recommendations for improving it.

For example, I hope that this conference will make clear the need for increased emphasis on the principle announced in the Housing Acts of 1949 and 1954 that Federal aid will not be offered unless it is in conformity with general plans for community development which have been locally prepared and adopted. Should not all Federal-aid programs be predicated on local planning considerations, whether for urban renewal, for public works, for schools, for highways, air transport or any other loan or assistance program including mortgage insurance. If there are some exceptions to this principle, such as national defense, we should recognize them and understand them.

This brings us to our topic of this afternoon where the machinery for local planning—that is, State, County and Metropolitan—will be discussed in relation to the Federal government's activities.

Federal Relationship to State Planning

FRANCIS A. PITKIN, Director, Bureau of Community Development, Pennsylvania Department of Commerce, Consultant to the Pennsylvania State Planning Board, Past President of ASPDA and ASPO

IT IS obvious that we could take any one of a great number of starting points in any effort to give historical background to our consideration of this subject of Federal Relationship to State Planning. We might start with some of the border disputes between our early States, in the settlement of which the Federal Government played a part. Or we might start with the Federal land grants in subsidy to our early railroads, influences which had profound effect on the state planning of a century ago. Or, following that line of thought, we might think of the Federal grants which led to the establishment of our land grant colleges, agencies which have through succeeding generations made a remarkable contribution toward the effective utilization of our state resources. Perhaps, however, for our immediate concern the starting point might be advanced to, let us say 1930 or 1931, a quarter of a century ago, when—as far as can now be determined—there was not a single state planning board in the country. It is true that some agencies had been established with the objective of state advertising or state economic development, an example of which might be the Greater Pennsylvania Council which existed briefly in that period. But it and doubtless similar agencies in other States failed to survive the hazards of early youth.

If, however, we shift our attention from 1930 to 1935 we find that in that short period forty-seven of our States—every State but Delaware—had established a state planning agency of one kind or another. Manifestly this wholesale creation of state planning agencies was not a coincidence—it stemmed directly from a series of stimuli applied by the Federal government.

If we think back to those troubled depression days we may recall that in July, 1933, President Roosevelt appointed a National Planning Board in the Public Works Administration. This was merged into the National Resources Board on June 30, 1934. The purpose of this latter Board according to the Executive Order creating it was “to prepare and present to the President a program and plan of procedure dealing with the physical, social, governmental and economic aspects of public policies for the development and use of land, water and other national resources and such other subjects as may from time to time be referred to it by the President.” It is quite understandable that early in its program this National planning agency recognized that ours is a tremendous country, with tremendous resources, tremendous problems and a tremendous number of divided responsibilities, making it inconceivable that any centralized agency could plan effectively for the whole country and for the wide range of subjects included in the President’s Executive Order. Understandably, then, communications from the National

planning agency—and the names involved were Harold L. Ickes, Chairman, and Frederic A. Delano, Vice-Chairman, were sent to the Governors of our forty-eight states, urging the creation of state planning boards to work in the same general field as outlined in the President's Executive Order. Simultaneously the National Board undertook to encourage further the establishment of such state planning boards by offering to provide for a limited period of time the services of competent consultants. These then were the primary Federal stimuli which led to the creation by 1935 of forty-seven state planning agencies.

It is interesting to note that a review of the current issue of the Directory issued by the Association of State Planning and Development Agencies reveals that only eight of those original state planning agencies are in existence today under the original name, and that one of those eight reveals a period of inactivity of fourteen years prior to its recent reactivation. Actually, of course, this is a deceptive picture since every-one of our forty-eight States now has one or more agencies dedicated to state planning or development, or both, most of them lineal descendants of those pioneer planning agencies of 1934 and 1935. While agency names have been altered and fields of responsibility have been changed or re-defined, some heritage of the early state planning responsibility remains in most cases.

In the development of our early state planning programs most of us attempted to transplant the master plan concept from the city planning level to our new state planning efforts. While this worked reasonably well in some fields of direct state responsibility—state highway plans, state park plans, state institution plans, and a few others—it was early apparent that there was a tremendous gap in the State's authority to control or guide land use. We were forced to recognize that our States had given to our local governmental units most of the basic powers essential to the execution of any truly comprehensive master plan. We were also faced with the same basic problem which led the National planning agency to seek the help of forty-eight States—the fact that our States in most cases were so large that no centralized agency could, even if it was otherwise desirable, plan in the great detail necessary to accomplish effectively our basic objectives. With one or two exceptions, the state planning agencies which survived were those which recognized that effective state planning on any comprehensive basis must depend upon effective planning programs in each local governmental jurisdiction within our State. Accordingly, many of us assumed as one of our major responsibilities the job of stimulating local planning, of attempting to guide it along useful lines, of providing technical consulting service and, in fact, of trying to do for our local governmental units exactly what the National Resources Board did for the state planning agencies back in 1934 and the years immediately following. It is of interest to note that among the state planning agencies which have survived under

their original names we find those which most effectively developed and maintained local planning assistance as a major part of their state planning programs. This was a type of state planning which found understanding and support among state legislators, while some of the other types of programs seemed quite friendless in legislative halls.

If we review the programs of the forty States in which there is no longer a state planning board under that name, but in almost every one of which there is now a department of economic development, a department of commerce, or some other such development agency, we find that while some retain active local planning assistance programs, in many of them not even a vestigial remnant can be found. In 1954, however, a new Federal stimulus was applied and it is already evident that state planning activity in the field of local and regional planning assistance is again expanding. This new stimulus, of course, was Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954—which was included in that Act on the recommendation of the President's Advisory Committee on Government Housing Policies and Programs. As most of you know now, and as all of you certainly will know by the end of this Conference, Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 makes possible Federal assistance in the technical planning programs of small communities and of metropolitan or regional planning areas. The law requires that this assistance to small communities be channeled through state planning agencies. It is not my assignment to discuss this subject in any detail since this will be handled by other speakers on the Conference program. Suffice it to say that in my own State of Pennsylvania our announcement of the availability of this Federal planning assistance brought forth expressions of interest from 135 of our communities, at least 30 of which had had no previous history of local planning. All of our four then-existing regional planning agencies also were interested. And, further, our number of regional planning commissions has more than doubled during the past year as a direct result of these new possibilities of Federal assistance in the financing of the regional programs.

It is also interesting to note that a number of the States, which have had no state planning program involving local planning assistance, have during the past year enacted legislation giving some state agency the power to accept Federal urban planning assistance funds and to expend them for community or regional planning work, thus qualifying as a "state planning agency" as that term is used in the Housing Act of 1954.

Accordingly, quite apart from the value of the specific community planning studies which will be carried out under the provisions of Section 701, two other, very real benefits are apparent—the reactivating of a broader type of state planning in the programs of some of our state economic development agencies, and the stimulation of the creation of the great many local and regional planning agencies in many States.

While I have emphasized thus far the two Federal programs which

have provided such effective stimuli to state planning and which happen to embody the term "planning" in the programs of the agencies with which they are concerned, there have been concurrently literally dozens of other Federal activities of direct concern to those who are involved in state planning, no matter how you may define that term. And in that connection might I suggest that although some of our fraternity would make planning a mystic rite to be practiced only by a very small and select group, still in honesty we must admit that a terrific amount of state planning is done by many other state agencies, including, of course, our departments of highways, natural resources, conservation, our land grant colleges and others too numerous to mention, none of which would claim to be "state planning" agencies. Admittedly, much of this is "project" planning and by no stretch of the imagination could be considered as the comprehensive coordinated sort of planning in which most of us are interested. However, be it good, bad or indifferent, it is one kind of state planning and there is a terrific amount of it.

Almost everyone of these agencies has a multiplicity of connections with the Federal Government and depends upon the Federal Government for assistance in many fields. The cash grants-in-aid provided by the Federal Government in fields associated in one way or another with state planning include such obvious ones as Federal aid for highways, and for hospital assistance, civilian defense, public assistance, employment security, education, forestry, slum clearance and urban renewal, low-rent housing, defense public works, community facilities, agricultural extension work, and many, many others, totaling billions of dollars per year.

Much as we may seek and welcome these Federal cash grants-in-aid, the Federal subsidy is not the most important part of these programs, if we would but recognize it. For many of our States, the returns received from the Federal Treasury for such Federal aid is only a small fraction of the Federal taxes collected in that State for uses which are nationwide in scope and which, of course, are of great national importance. The national planning, implemented by such subsidies, is, however, of vital importance to state planning.

The Federal highway system, for instance, provides a basic pattern for the highway layout of every one of our States. A State's planning, which did not take account of the through system of highways agreed upon through Federal and state cooperation and embodied in the National highway plan, would fail to provide adequate services for its citizens in the important undertaking of connecting their homes and places of business with every other home and business establishment in the United States. The inducement of a considerable Federal subsidy to a State whose highways can serve the national interest is practically irresistible, just as within most of our States state-aid for local highway construction shapes and ensures the efficiency of our intra-state pattern.

The implementation of Federal assistance for slum clearance and urban redevelopment requires coordinating activities involving both state and local planning, particularly in States in which a state redevelopment assistance program parallels the Federal program. Low rent housing or advances for public works planning would achieve little for the public good if it were not required that the necessity for them be established by agencies of state or local government in cooperation with the Federal agencies involved. The effect of those associations in which local, state and Federal concerns are joined for the amelioration of conditions harmful to the general welfare is to bring to bear on many of our planning problems the combined experience of three levels of government. The results achieved have, I believe, fully justified this type of cooperation. The delicate system of checks and balances, involved in these cooperative activities, has proved quite as successful in checking the encroachment of the several levels of government—Federal, state and local—on each other's fields, just as it has operated in the Federal constitution to restrain the executive, legislative and judicial branches of our government from usurping improper authority.

In the field of conservation, while there have been understandable jealousies at times between state and Federal agencies, the competition developed by those jealousies has frequently led to a very high level of performance and finally to a mutual respect between agencies of the Land Grant colleges, the Agricultural Extension Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the State Soil Conservation Commissions and the County Soil Conservation districts.

State planning, facing the serious problem of soil depletion, must recognize the functions of all those agencies and endeavor to secure cooperation where cooperation is needed, but it would not deny the powerful impetus which the nationwide attack on soil erosion has provided as a spur to the efforts of the States and the local districts in dealing with this serious and universal problem. These are merely instances of the inter-play between Federal activity and state and local activity influencing the planning process in the many directions in which the Federal government provides grants-in-aid or technical assistance.

There is, however, still another type of Federal assistance to state planning which involves no cash grants-in-aid, but which is absolutely essential to the program of every state planning agency. This, of course, is the provision of basic information on which our planning programs must depend.

Certainly none of us could function without the information provided to us by the Department of Interior's Geologic Survey. The U.S.G.S. topographic maps are an absolute essential for state and local planning for economic development programs, as well as for public and private construction activities and as a basis for our geologic studies. The Bureau of Mines in that same department is also of vital importance

to many of our States. A full knowledge of the mineral resources of a State is basic in any attempt to improve its economy. No State in our Nation could plan intelligently for the development of its mineral wealth if the Nation had not long ago built up through those agencies an accessible body of data which is available at merely nominal cost.

The Department of Commerce, through the Bureau of the Census, the oldest and most important fact-gathering agency of the Nation, has been since 1790 providing detailed information about the growth and character of our population. The Office of Business Economics, of that same Department, as well as its Office of Area Development, have assisted and quite frequently spurred state planning and development agencies, as well as agencies of local government, in regard to programs of community and area improvement. The Civil Aeronautics Administration provides information and controls fundamental in the planning of routes and landing fields for air transportation. The Coast and Geodetic Survey has made available for our use not only a service of navigational aids for air or water, but also the precise surveying grid to which our U.S.G.S. topographic maps are referenced, without which certain phases of state planning would be impossibly difficult. The Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Labor provides vital information as to employment, wages and the cost of living. The Bureau of Employment Security follows for us the sometimes rapid changes in the demand for labor. Vital data are made available through facts collected by the Social Security system, the Public Health Service, the Federal Power Commission, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, as well as the regional Federal Reserve Banks. These and many other Federal agencies are sources of the statistical data and other basic information on which our state and local planning programs must depend.

In addition to all this statistical information, we also receive valuable assistance through the programs of the National Park Service, the Fish and Wild Life Service, U. S. Forestry Service, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Corps of Engineers of the U. S. Army and many others.

Among all these are agencies with which we develop cooperative programs when our need is for such things as topographic maps, aerial photographs or information on the quantity and quality of our surface and ground water resources. These are the agencies whose assistance we solicit when we need help in urban renewal or flood control. These are the agencies to which we turn when we need technical guidance on geodetic surveying or photogrammetric reproduction or many other specialized activities. These agencies have a tremendous number of career technicians, each highly competent in his specialized field and all available to consult with state officials on any planning problem. It is obvious that no one state could either find or afford to maintain such a large and diversified array of technical talent.

The large attendance every year at the technical seminars in Washington, arranged by the Association of State Planning and Development Agencies between state planning and development officials and selected representatives of agencies of the Federal government, is evidence of our acknowledged dependence upon the vast resources of information available through the research agencies of our National government.

Certainly the job of any planning agency would become quite impossible if the flow of information and service between our state and Federal governments was cut off. Even though, in some cases, the Federal data comes directly from State sources, the Federal assembling and processing is important since Washington serves as a great clearing house to render comparable the information which we need from other states as well as our own to enable us to view our own program in its relationship to the rest of the Nation.

Complex as our system of government often seems to folk from smaller Nations, the success and stability it has achieved, has been due largely to this type of active and effective cooperation between our various levels of government—each level performing the part of the job for which it is best fitted and with assistance of various kinds going both up and down the ladder of governmental structure. Nowhere does this mutual dependence of the small and great in government appear more evident than in the field of planning.

The Federal Government and the County

MALCOLM H. DILL, Director, Baltimore County Office of Planning

EVERYONE knows what a State is, as applied to the United States, but I suspect that not everyone in this room would give an equally clear definition of a county. The American College dictionary defines it as follows: "The political unit next below the State in the United States." Webster's Unabridged Dictionary says of a county, "In the United States, the largest division for local government in all States except Louisiana, where the corresponding division is the parish. The county is subdivided for governmental purposes into minor civil divisions (so-called) such as townships, towns, plantations, locations, purchases, grants, surpluses." Would anyone like to try for the answer to the \$64,000 question as to where all such minor civil divisions are found?

There are tremendous variations of size between counties in the United States. Oddly enough, the smallest one is found in our largest city. New York County, of which New York is listed as the County Seat, occupies 22 square miles. In contrast to that, San Bernardino County in California comprises over 20,000 square miles. There is equally great variation from the standpoint of population. The largest is Cook County in Illinois, which contains the City of Chicago, the county's population being 4,508,800; the smallest county in population is Armstrong County in South Dakota which, though comprising 518 square miles, has a population of 52. It doesn't even have a county seat.

Having in mind the two factors of concentrations of urban population and the occurrence of political subdivisions below the county level, there appear to be five different types of conditions in which the county finds itself in an increasingly complicated situation, both for planning activities and those involving other kinds of governmental functions. The first situation is that of a county which lacks a large urban population in any one locality, though it may comprise one or more small towns. In the second type the county includes a dominant, sizeable central city and all or most of its metropolitan area. An example is Allegheny County which includes not only Pittsburgh, but about all of the other concentrated community areas that make up the metropolitan city. Other large central cities that are located close to the centers of their counties are Indianapolis and Columbus, and among smaller cities, York and Lancaster, Pennsylvania. A third type of county situation is that in which a metropolitan area includes two or more counties and one or more central cities, as well as numerous smaller suburban communities. Examples are the metropolitan areas of Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Minneapolis-St. Paul. Still more complicated from the standpoint of political jurisdictions are those cities such as New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and Washington, where the metropolitan area spreads into two or more States. Finally, the metropolitan

area may even involve two Nations, as in the case of metropolitan Detroit. Obviously the relative simplicity or complication of the situation in which a county is found tends to have much to do with the degree of effectiveness with which it can operate in respect to planning and to those aspects of government that have to do with the carrying out of plans.

Another factor besides the multiplicity of political subdivisions has a bearing on the effectiveness of counties as operating governmental units. Webster's definition of a county includes the following additional comment: "The administrative functions of the county are more important than those of the town in the Southern States, less important than those of the town in the New England States, and in the Middle and Western States, of about equal importance." Counties in the New England States, I understand, are of rather negligible importance. Cities and villages and the towns in which they lie are the effective governmental units. In some parts of Pennsylvania, particularly in suburban Philadelphia, townships, which, generally speaking, correspond somewhat to the New England towns, have considerable local governmental importance, particularly in suburban Philadelphia where there are large urban suburbs that are not incorporated. Around Pittsburgh, cities and boroughs tend to dominate, as compared with townships. By contrast, in Ohio and parts of Indiana the township is practically an obsolete political subdivision. Various other cases could be cited in which the importance of counties varies greatly, from situations where the county is highly potent as a governmental unit, to others in which the county is little more than a persistent but irrelevant political ghost. I think it is correct to state that the outstanding instance of county importance within its own boundaries occurs in Baltimore County, Maryland, where the county is the *only* political subdivision below the state level. Because of the extreme variations to which I have referred as far as counties are concerned, it is impossible for me to generalize to any extent and to speak for all, or even many of the counties in the country. For that reason I hope there may be some value to be gained from my taking Baltimore County as an example of the potential significance of the county as an effective political subdivision, and noting some of the pertinent facts about it.

Baltimore County shares its north border with the State of Pennsylvania, and lies along the west side of Chesapeake Bay. It nearly surrounds but does not include Baltimore City, which seceded from the County in 1851. Baltimore County comprises 610 square miles of land area. Its present population is estimated as at least 390,000 which means a growth of 120,000 since the 1950 Census. Nine distinct suburban communities are spread roughly in the shape of a horseshoe around the west, north, and east sides of Baltimore City. These range in population from 15,000 to 70,000. None of these communities is incorporated, but

they are much more than residential dormitories for Baltimore City. Several, such as Towson, the County Seat, with an estimated population of between 50,000 and 60,000, and Dundalk, 70,000 have distinct identities of their own, and to a considerable extent are independent of the central city.

The County has a diversified and strong economic base, including such establishments as the Glenn L. Martin Company and Bethlehem Steel's Sparrows Point Shipyard and Steel Plant—the largest tidewater steel plant in the country, and which, with the \$200,000,000 expansion just announced, will become the largest steel plant in the world.

Except for a relatively short stretch along the south side, Baltimore City is all but surrounded by Baltimore County, through which run all but one of the major arterial routes. Two other counties, however, are close enough to Baltimore City to be materially affected by metropolitan development. In all these three counties there are only three incorporated areas. Only one of these has more than 3500 population—the City of Annapolis—which is sufficiently removed from Baltimore City to be an urban center in its own right.

Baltimore County is governed by a three-man Board of County Commissioners, one of whom is elected by the voters as the Chairman. It is very much of a fulltime job for all three. This Board constitutes the one taxing authority below the state level in the County's 610 square miles. The 1956 Budget is \$53,000,000, with a real estate tax rate of \$1.98 per thousand, on an assessed valuation of \$1,275,000,000. The latter figure is nearly three times the valuation of \$454,631,000 in 1950, reflecting the rather extraordinary rate of growth in the County. For all intents and purposes the urban section of the County (about 250 square miles) is governed as if it were an incorporated city, and lacks few if any of the services a city would provide. One Board of Education serves the entire County. Since 1946, 81 new schools or major additions have been built, are under construction, or in the process of being planned. New school sites are usually proposed by, and always must have the approval of the Office of Planning. Schools are planned as joint School-Recreation Centers so that the maximum and most effective community and neighborhood use can be made of school buildings and grounds. Recommended site areas for these School-Recreation Centers are 20 acres for elementary schools, and from 30 to 40 acres for junior or senior high schools. Members of the Board of Education are appointed with overlapping terms by the Governor, but the School Budget is part of the over-all County Budget and must be approved by the Board of County Commissioners.

A Six-Year Capital Improvement Program, the first, is now in process of preparation by the Office of Planning. The latter agency was set up as of June 1st, 1955, by a Baltimore County Planning Enabling Act, which had been passed by the previous State Legislature, with the spon-

sorship of the present Board of County Commissioners. Planning, however, had been initiated in 1947 under the state-wide enabling act. The Office of Planning as newly constituted, consists of the Planning Board and its staff. The Board is composed of six lay members and three ex-officio members. The latter include one of the County Commissioners, the Superintendent of Schools, and the Director of the Department of Public Works. Lay members are appointed for six-year overlapping terms, four as residents of certain designated divisions of the County; two are appointed at large. Lay members receive \$25 for each meeting attended. The present staff consists of 15 persons, with three additional positions now open. Of the 15, seven have Master's degrees, five of them in Planning, and one also has a Doctor's degree in geography. The Budget figure for the Office of Planning for 1956 is \$122,000.

There is a thoroughly cooperative relationship between our planning activities and those of Baltimore City and the two other nearest Counties, Anne Arundel and Howard. Negotiations are nearly complete for organization of a Baltimore Metropolitan Planning Council, which would have as constituents Baltimore City and the three counties mentioned, plus two other adjacent ones. This metropolitan planning agency is being set up through the State Planning Commission and the Federal Urban Renewal Agency, which is expected to provide matching funds.

From time to time in the past there have been various movements aimed at changing the basic type of government in Baltimore County. The most recent of these involved a successful public referendum on the issue of appointing a Committee to draw up a charter for the County. This Committee completed its report several months ago and the issue will be voted on next November. The Charter would establish an elected County Council of seven members, one from each of seven councilmanic districts. Councilmen, however, would be elected by the voters of the entire County. The Council would have the power to legislate on local matters. It would meet for an annual legislative session in May of each year, and at least once each month during the rest of the year. A County Executive would be the official head of the County Government. As an elected officer, he would be responsible directly to the people for efficient administration. He would appoint the members of, and serve ex-officio on certain Boards and Commissions.

Recognizing that the County Government is now equivalent to a \$53,000,000 annual business, the Charter Board provided that the administrative affairs of the County would be run by a man highly trained and thoroughly experienced in administrative work. The appointment of this County Administrative Officer, by the County Executive, would be subject to confirmation by the County Council. He, in turn, would appoint, subject to confirmation by the County Executive, heads of all offices and departments other than the County Solicitor, and other than the heads of those departments which are regulated by

State Law. The proposed Charter establishes six offices and eight departments in the administrative services. The term "office" refers to agencies performing services for other County agencies. The term "department" refers to agencies performing services directly for the people. The offices would be Law, Personnel, Finance, Budget, Central Services, and Planning and Zoning. The departments would be Public Works, Permits and Licenses, Public Safety, Recreation, Education, Libraries, Health, and Welfare. The last four departments mentioned are wholly or in part controlled by State Law. The Charter cannot and would not in any manner attempt to change their organization or operation. A non-partisan committee has been formed which will seek to promote, on a County-wide basis, the passage of the proposed Charter at the November election.

Now I don't want you to think that I invariably look at Baltimore County through rose-colored glasses. Naturally there are some drawbacks about having so large an area under a single governmental agency. Just the element of size, combined with the long-drawn-out shape of its urban development, imposes certain difficult problems, such as provision of utilities, streets, and other kinds of public improvements. The urban area of Baltimore County is strung out for a distance of about 35 miles around the periphery of Baltimore City. Some of the County communities can be reached conveniently from others only by going through the City. That is a situation, however, which would be equally true if those same communities were separately incorporated. In other words, the central governmental agency has problems that are inherent in a very tenuous rather than a highly concentrated urban area. This situation of being strung out also has a tendency to affect the way in which citizens in one section feel or don't feel about the affairs of those in another. It is naturally rather difficult to expect residents of Catonsville, in the southwestern part of the County, to be particularly interested in local problems of Dundalk in the southeastern part of the County, at a crow-flight distance of about 12 miles. But the same thing would be true of these areas if they were separate municipalities or even parts of a single large city. You might say, that the residents of a city in the eastern part of a State don't feel particularly concerned about the problems of those in the western part. That doesn't suggest however that there ought to be two separate States rather than a single one.

Another difficulty connected with Baltimore County's having a number of large unincorporated urban communities rather than separate municipalities with definite boundaries, stems from the fact that there does not tend to be the same recognition given to their interests and problems by the State and Federal levels of government, that there would be if they were incorporated cities, entirely apart from a large metropolitan area. It is natural that isolated cities in Maryland such as Hagerstown, Cumberland, and Frederick would be recognized by

the State Roads Commission as requiring modern, efficient, connecting highways, and bypass routes. Until rather recent years, however, the same thinking was not applied to the suburban communities around Baltimore even though in some cases these had at least twice the populations of the cities mentioned. Baltimore City, with a population of about 1,000,000, now receives from the State gasoline and motor vehicle revenue fund almost \$15,000,000 a year toward its streets. Baltimore County, with an urban population of just about one-third of the City's, receives an allocation of only \$1,100,000 a year toward its County road system, which includes more mileage than does the City's street system and which is vastly more in need of widening and general improvement. From Federal-aid funds the County system receives only \$200,000 annually. Admittedly the relative costs of new expressways and major routes within the City are in some cases much greater than those of creating comparable routes in the suburban county area. Nevertheless, the actual needs in mileage of the rapidly growing urban areas of the County, not to speak of other routes of importance in the more rural sections, are very great.

One other point might be raised as constituting a disadvantage resulting from having so large an area under a single governmental agency. A couple of years ago, when I was participating in a seminar on schools at M. I. T., one New England gentleman expressed horror at what he felt was a very un-democratic situation here in Baltimore County, where so many people lived in so large an area and had what he thought was so little to say in the government of their immediate localities. He of course reflected the general attitude exemplified in many parts of New England by maintenance of interest in the New England town meeting type of government. Admirable as that may be, it isn't necessarily applicable everywhere.

It does seem to me that we have a great deal of application of democratic principles here in Baltimore County. For example, the whole recreational program is based on participation by local recreation councils in the County recreation program. Over a period of the last seven years or so, recreation councils have been set up in practically all the concentrated localities. There are now 43 such councils, wherein the people organize to cooperate with the County Recreation Department on local recreational programs. The County supplies the supervision and usually the place for recreation in the form of school plants, and the Recreation Council supplies equipment and a certain amount of volunteer services. During the past year these Councils raised over \$120,000 toward their shares of the program.

I think the same principle of decentralization applies to the school picture. Local P.T.A.'s play a large part in the handling of school affairs within their own neighborhoods and communities. It is hard to believe that they do anything but gain in respect to the general standards of

education throughout the County by having a comprehensive and well-ordered plan both for curriculum and for the location of school plants, rather than having the latter spotted in relation to municipal boundaries that are often arbitrary and which by no means always provide the most logical basis for spacing of schools.

I have lived in a number of other cities and localities where the governmental situation was very much more complicated than it is here. Taking everything into consideration, I feel strongly that the advantages of the single County-wide government as exemplified in Baltimore County far outweigh any disadvantages there may be.

Well, so what! Assuming it be admitted that a single county government, uncomplicated by minor civil divisions is—as Hamlet said, “A consummation devoutly to be wished”—is there anything that other localities, other metropolitan areas where multiplicity rather than simplicity is the rule, can do to help the situation. I have neither time nor ability to go into a lengthy discussion of the inherent possibilities of metropolitan government. It may suffice to make a brief mention of two or three possibilities that might be given further scrutiny. The most obvious, but not necessarily the best answer is annexation of unincorporated or incorporated areas to the central city. Very much more unusual is the process of amalgamation or merging of two or more suburban communities or even counties. I believe I have heard of two counties in the vicinity of Chattanooga, Tennessee, that merged. The strong tendency for minor political divisions to cherish jealously their autonomous rights makes it unrealistic to expect extensive voluntary merging of their political identities. It is even less likely that they would readily consider going back into a state of being just unincorporated areas within a county. We do see a marked trend, in respect to the planning function, toward joint city-county or metropolitan planning organizations. As essentially advisory bodies, these joint or regional planning agencies doubtless appear more acceptable to their respective constituent governmental bodies and citizens than would be the case if they were to perform various types of public service functions. There are, however, numerous examples of ad hoc agencies that have performed some such functions, including metropolitan park boards, sewer and water authorities, and consolidated school systems. Although there is as yet nothing comparable in this country, we can look toward Toronto where the actual idea of metropolitan government has been exemplified, at least in respect to certain governmental functions.

By this time you may well wonder, in view of the fact that the title of my talk was supposed to be *The Federal Government and The County*, just when I'm going to get around to that particular subject. Actually I don't intend to, other than in the general way in which such relationships have been somewhat implied during my talk. I would say simply that the significance of relationships between a county and the Federal

Government obviously depends largely on the significance of the county itself, as exemplified in a particular situation. In the case of New England Counties there may be little occasion for dealings between them and the Federal Government. In other places, however, where the county is something more than a vestige, there may well be increasing mutual discussion and activity in regard to such matters as Urban Renewal, Federal Funds for Highways, Schools, and so forth.

I appreciate having had this opportunity to discuss the subject of counties with you, and hope I haven't bored you by going into too much detail. Obviously, you are not interested in Baltimore County as such, but the situation is so unique that I felt it might be worth-while to outline the potentialities, under favorable circumstances, of this largest type of political subdivision below the State level, that is, the county. Possibly, Baltimore County can serve as somewhat of a guinea pig or proving ground in demonstrating what a county can be and do under optimum conditions and that it would be worth-while for other areas to take appropriate steps toward achieving a similar kind of governmental simplicity through one device or another.

The Future of Metropolitan Regional Planning

FREDERICK GUTHEIM, Member National Capitol Regional Planning Council

METROPOLITAN regional planning can point to its beginnings in New York with the regional plan of 1929, and the Tri-State plan for the Philadelphia region which followed immediately. Earlier Fritz Schumacher's notable plan for Hamburg and the lower Elbe basin, Robert Schmidt's Ruhr valley plan, and studies of the greater London area had outlined the framework for the planning of metropolitan regions. After a quarter century of relative stagnation we are now in what might be called the metropolitan regional boom. The number of metropolitan regional planning organizations has grown prodigiously, and while many are such in name only, or have jurisdiction limited to a central city and an adjoining county, many others in Detroit, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Washington and similar cities are moving rapidly toward significant planning achievements. If we are to speculate on the future of this activity, we would do well to consider first what has generated this spectacular and sudden growth.

The answer, in a word, is suburbanization. The boom in metropolitan regional planning is part of the larger interest in metropolitan phenomena of all sorts. It is paralleled by accelerated interest in metropolitan regional government, by the appreciation of the region as the natural market, by the growth of port authorities and other special governmental districts, by studies of the metropolitan region by industries

seeking future sites or business locating branch stores or shopping centers, by utilities of all sorts, public and private. The metropolitan region has become the unit for electric power companies whether they are planning service facilities, power loads or the location of substations or new generating facilities. It has become the fundamental basis for school building planning, as in the Michigan area studies. It is the area for newspaper circulation and the distribution of milk. The metropolitan region is the area of mass transport service—and of regulation. It is the district studied by the highway planner. Guided by earlier findings of ecologists, demographers, sociologists, we see today in a fascinating multiplicity of separate activities that the metropolitan region is the essential social and economic building block of urban America—and we suspect it will become the political building block as well.

The interest that has been generated in this general subject has taken many forms. The Government Affairs Foundation is planning a national conference that will bring together many who are studying metropolitan government. The National Municipal League has drafted a state enabling act for metropolitan regional planning. The Ford Foundation has determined that fruitful research may be conducted in this field. The Housing and Home Finance Agency has undertaken a program of grants-in-aid for metropolitan regional planning to stimulate activity of this sort.

Out of this activity we can discern several main themes. The interdependence of central city and suburb, of suburb and suburb within a metropolitan region is one of them. This interdependence is especially evident in water resources, sanitation, mass transportation and other services. Frequently it is expressed in terms of conflict. A second main theme is the recognition of common, area-wide needs. The provision of large regional parks is beyond the resources of any individual suburb, to take one example, but greatly desired by the entire region.

But the quest for viable programs in the field of metropolitan regional problems has encountered difficulties. General apprehension is the response to proposals for metropolitan regional government. The fear of super-governments, of more complex and remote—as well as of additional—levels of government, is a very real one. It involves the issues of autonomy, of local responsibility, of the cost. These are not likely soon to be resolved. Nor is there a bright prospect for immediate action.

I was tempted to say last week that our concern with metropolitan government needs to be counterbalanced by an equal concern with smaller, neighborhood-sized units of government. Jefferson realized this in this appeal for a stronger ward system in Virginia to counteract the powers he reluctantly granted the state government. But it may be the secret to finding a reassuring role for suburban communities in a larger governmental framework, and it points to some federated form of regional government.

In this rather disorderly picture, metropolitan regional planning is considering its role. It has been deprecated by critics who assert that until there is some regional governmental context, metropolitan area planning is futile. Certainly without such a context there can be no planning in the sense we have known it in cities and counties, where the police power has been enlisted to provide zoning and subdivision regulation, and where an apparatus of capital budgets, mandatory referrals and other devices are implementing planning within the structure of local government. Without such a context and lacking such powers metropolitan regional planning is mercifully free of administrative and regulatory duties. It is free to concentrate on developing a better picture of the metropolitan region, to illuminate its present problems, to discover its potentialities, to propose activities and undertakings that help realize them.

Research is the tool by which metropolitan regional planning unfolds the future. To a degree this research grows from land use, population, economic base and other studies that have been developed in city planning. But it goes beyond these. It must consider a broader framework of natural resources. The peaceful co-existence of agricultural and urban development is a durable ideal of planners and architects, whether Frank Lloyd Wright or LeCorbusier. The skyscraper rising in the fields, the cows grazing in front of city hall, are familiar utopias of our day. But a harsher reality must also be faced. Dwindling water resources compel a regional approach to questions of supply and utilization. Conservation demands attention to stream pollution. Regional planning must also consider opportunities implicit in its larger geographical framework. Of these the most important is the development of new towns. The dispersal of industry and governmental installations can only be accommodated in a regional framework. Regional planning must consider the region as an economic and social fact, its characteristics as a market, its relative competitive position to other regions, its longer developmental potentialities in the light of new technology. Finally, regional planning must look farther ahead.

To those who challenge the practical value of such activity when a governmental context is lacking, I offer these suggestions. We need more metropolitan mindedness. This consciousness must be detailed in many special fields if it is to be effective. The planning process has compelling educational qualifications that reach into every strata and segment of the metropolitan community and will accomplish an awareness of the regional nature of individual problems as nothing else will. Local planning by cities and counties within the region will be greatly strengthened by regional planning. Here in the Washington region, for example, county planning in Fairfax and Montgomery has offered stronger proposals for low density along the upper Potomac because regional studies have shown the desirability of such plans. Finally, the

eventual day of metropolitan regional government will be hastened by regional planning. And I venture to say that the eventual decisions on regional government—whether by annexation, by the proliferation of special regional authorities, by the creation of regional supergovernments—will be sounder because of regional planning that commences today.

But despite the metropolitan regional boom, our planning arrangements in this field are still relatively neglected. We are putting the grease on the squeaky wheels. Federal activity, which appeared to promise so much when President Eisenhower urged enactment of Title VII's aid to metropolitan regional planning two years ago, has been diverted to areas of relatively easy accomplishment, and activities more congenial to its special interest in housing. Compared to the efforts expended in developing workable programs, or comprehensive city plans for urban redevelopment and renewal, suburban and metropolitan planning are neglected areas. Fortunately the program is still relatively new. Albert M. Cole, HHFA administrator asserted last week, "We view it as a continuing and expanding program." And as to the relation of local regional planning to the operating programs of Federal housing agencies, Mr. Cole tended to take the comprehensive view that such planning aimed at a total reorientation of urban arrangements so that projects would be undertaken in a fresh context. All this is good news. It means that the failure of the past two years to stimulate and assist metropolitan regional planning need not condemn its future. But bolder and more energetic administration, and more liberal interpretations of the law are necessary if we are to secure progress in metropolitan regional planning without the more drastic steps of amending Title VII of the Housing Act.

My view of the future of metropolitan regional planning is an optimistic and expansive one. Tremendous creative energies are latent in this field. Once communications have been established among groups already working separately on individual aspects of the problem, we can expect prodigious activity.

The Role of New York State in Urban Renewal

JOSEPH P. McMURRAY, Commissioner of Housing,
State of New York, Albany

BECAUSE New York often acts as a laboratory for the rest of the country, I believe some of the things we have been doing will be of interest to you. One cannot very well discuss Federal-State relationships today in the related fields of housing and urban planning without beginning with the Kestenbaum report, a document to which we in New York State government gave detailed attention. Governor Harriman requested his cabinet officers to analyze the sections of the report bearing on the work of each Commissioner's department. As a result, the report not only caused a review of Federal-state-local intergovernment relations on the national level, but also on other levels as well.

When Federal-State relationships are reviewed, one of the first questions to come up is whether the State ought to be the exclusive pipeline through which Federal financial aid flows to the cities. After considerable discussion and review of past public housing experience in New York State, we in the Division of Housing took the position that the State should not be the sole channel through which Washington helps U. S. cities; that our cities should continue to exercise their right to contract directly with the Federal government for such assistance as the Congress may make available from time to time.

The basic reason for our point of view rests on the well known fact that in the great majority of our States, the rural counties have a greater per capita representation in the legislatures than the urbanized counties. The legislator from predominately rural counties cannot be expected to have as comprehensive a grasp of urban problems as his city colleague, so that if a state legislature or government had to act before a city could contract for each Federal Title I or public housing project, our national program of public housing and urban renewal would be delayed if not severely curtailed.

In this question, New York State has a unique position in that on the one hand, the State has a governmental department which finances public housing and offers various state aids to city planning. On the other hand, the State contains one of the largest world cities.

While channeling Federal funds through state agencies perhaps would not curtail public housing in New York State, though it probably would in other States, it would still be difficult and presumptuous now to reverse the precedent established in the 1930's and have New York City receive aid from the Federal government only through Albany. The Democratic Administration of F.D.R. developed the right of the cities to direct access to the Federal government and Governor Harriman's administration is determined to maintain this right and not jeopardize it for cities in other States.

What then is the role of the State in the process of Federal aid? In New York State we don't want to infringe on local option—which is a question between New York City and Albany of long standing—but rather offer inducements to the cities by conducting experiments which few cities can afford, giving technical help and extending financing for public and private housing. Through such leadership in establishing standards and through our banking functions, the State can further housing and city planning more effectively than by attempting to become the exclusive channel for Federal aid to our localities.

The Division of Housing has been the agency which, through loan and subsidy contracts, has financed some 35,000 public housing dwellings in the State. Another 18,600 are under construction or in various stages of planning. Last year in New York City, construction began on 3,448 units financed by the State which exceeds the 3,158 units started there in the same period financed by the Federal Government.

The State finances public housing projects through local authorities in much the same way as the Federal program. The same local authority, as in the case of the New York City Housing Authority, often has both Federal and state public housing projects. Since the Division of Housing need only take into consideration conditions in New York State, our program can be more flexible than the Federal program and we can give more help to our local authorities, particularly the newer and smaller ones upstate.

New York State has recognized that subsidized public housing does not meet the needs of all our low-income people. The Legislature, the courts and the voters by referendum have recognized that there can be no gap between public housing and what the *private* market through the various Federal programs—F.H.A., V.A., and Home Loan Bank,—provide. This gap in low income housing has been filled by the limited-profit housing law which permits direct state loans to limited-profit rental projects and to co-operatives. These loans may be for as long as 50 years, cover 90 percent of the cost of a project, and the local government may give tax concessions up to 30 years amounting to not more than 50 percent of the improved value of the property. Funds will be raised by state bond issues which will set the cost of mortgage money to a development a little below 3 percent per year. The act permits the cities to make similar loans on the same terms within certain tax limits based on assessable value in the community.

The original Act and referendum permit only \$50 million to be used for this purpose out of a previously authorized 200-million-dollar-state bond issue for low-rent housing. This, of course, is not adequate in view of the need and can only be considered a beginning.

There will be no *windfalls* or excessive land valuations in this program. The volume of applications makes it possible to choose the best projects in the public interest. Nor need we have builder sponsored

co-ops which are not bona-fide, since we have a long history of an extensive co-operative housing movement in New York City backed by such powerful unions as the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, the International Ladies Garment Workers, the Electrical Workers, the Butcher Workers and others. The experience gained has been consolidated in the United Housing Foundation which has the sponsoring unions, co-operatives and other public interest bodies as members.

In this limited-profit act, profits to builders are limited to 5½ percent plus a share in savings so there is a maximum of 7½ percent profit. Return on equity is limited to 6 percent per year. Some of you will recognize in this act the outlines of Senator Sparkman's bill, S.2246 in the 81st Congress. We passed it on a bi-partisan basis in New York State; we hope our successful experience will induce the Congress to pass similar legislation. This is, of course, one of the roles of the States: to act as laboratories on a small scale for national legislation.

It is, I believe, important to explain the judicial review of *low rent* housing in New York State. We, like everywhere else in the country, have had opponents of public housing who objected to the State aiding low-income people to obtain decent homes. However, our courts have consistently interpreted *low rent housing* to mean housing at a rent below what the private market is supplying in significant quantities. Since, therefore, we had a large segment of our population unable to find decent housing at rents they could afford, but whose incomes were too high for public housing, the courts defined aids to these *in-between families* as aids to low-income families. We in New York State do not recognize that anyone should be ineligible for public housing and still not be able to afford *private* housing. Instead, we recognize that we should provide direct public housing for families who must have a subsidy; for those who can pay for housing without subsidy through the use of state credit and local tax concessions, we believe in co-operatives and limited-profit rental housing; for the rest we are relying on the H.H.F.A. aids and conventional building. Under this system the State intervenes in the housing market selectively to aid the weaker families; in both subsidized public housing and the limited-profit program, income limits are set both for admission and continued occupancy.

From both the state public housing and limited-profit programs we have an interest in the national urban renewal program. The state public housing law requires that there be slum clearance in connection with each project. I have established the policy that where vacant land sites are used, slum clearance takes place *off-site*, about 10 percent of the total project cost being devoted to this purpose. Many of our projects, of course, are themselves on slum sites and no *off-site* clearance is required. If there is to be effective *urban renewal* on a significant scale, public agencies will also find it necessary to redevelop pockets of deteriorated housing and other structures with public or limited-profit

housing. Here, too, our *off-site* program can be of service.

Our off-site program in itself cannot mean very much, but combined with the Federal urban renewal program and counted as a local contribution, it becomes important. One of the first things we did in the Division, under the Harriman administration, was to arrange with Commissioner Follin's office to permit our state off-site slum clearance funds to be counted as local contributions in the Federal Title I program.

The result of this agreement between Washington and New York State is that instead of a dollar of local contributions bringing in two dollars of Federal money, every dollar of local money matched by the State brings in four Federal dollars. I have already suggested to the Rains Committee of the House of Representatives that the present $\frac{1}{3}$ local contribution required of the cities in the Federal Title I program be lowered to $\frac{1}{6}$. Pending this change we are studying the advisability of the State supplementing local contributions in Federal Title I applications. We feel that such supplemental contributions may stimulate our cities to undertake slum clearance programs on a large enough scale. One of the basic problems in our study is how to avoid a substitution of state funds for local funds; the state contribution has to be supplementary and state standards and regulations have to insure that this would be the case.

Much the same approach is being made to urban renewal. This program, as you know, is thought of as operating in an area in which a substantial proportion of the buildings are not yet ready for demolition. We believe that to be successful it must be conducted on a fairly large scale—surely the planning unit must be larger than a single structure or city block. This is often spoken of by city planners as a neighborhood. However, the neighborhood is rather hard to define on Manhattan island; about all the planners will agree on here is that the neighborhood must be larger than just a few blocks.

Nevertheless, we think the urban renewal unit should have some kind of definable boundaries which mark it off from the rest of the city. Secondly, and what is perhaps more important, the *neighborhood* should have some sort of unifying factor—an institution or series of institutions like a university, schools, churches, settlement houses or even such commercial banking institutions which have a stake in bringing back or stabilizing values in the *neighborhood*.

Once a neighborhood is defined and local people and institutions indicate their willingness to get behind a renewal program the city has to make a plan including such public improvements as may be appropriate. These may take such forms as increased park area, street changes, improved facilities in the form of schools, libraries or park equipment. If a renewal program is to amount to anything, the public authority must do its part; otherwise little can be expected of private investors.

In making a plan for a neighborhood, pockets of deteriorated housing

and other land uses will be demarcated. These pockets must be removed. In this removal the State Division of Housing can help with both public and private housing.

Sites for public housing through the process of urban renewal will often mean smaller sites than we have been accustomed to, particularly in New York City. It is characteristic, for instance, of many older sections of Queens and Brooklyn that the core of a *neighborhood* will be sound although no longer fashionable. However, around the edges of the neighborhood, along the thoroughfares, miscellaneous and incompatible land uses have been permitted to creep in. Often much of the thoroughfare frontage remains vacant. If these peripheral areas are used for public or limited-profit housing, the decay of the neighborhood will have been arrested. We have not solved all the management problems connected with such small sites but we are conducting discussions with the New York City Housing Authority and Planning Commission besides investigating the feasibility of such small projects in our own development and management bureaus.

Fortunately, we have in New York City a successful prototype of an urban renewal program in Morningside Heights, Inc. In 1947 Columbia University and some 14 other institutions nearby formed a corporation: "to foster, plan, develop and promote the improvement, redevelopment and advancement of the Morningside Heights district of the Borough of Manhattan as an attractive residential, educational and cultural area."

Morningside Heights, Inc. has been in existence for 8 years. It has worked with its sponsoring institutions, private landlords, real estate interests, banks, co-operatives, state and city agencies including Robert Moses. The area is still far from perfect, but notable improvements have taken place: a large slum area has been replaced with a 1940 dwelling unit public housing development, ground has been broken for a 981-unit co-operative. There has been steady progress in integrating the facilities of Columbia and its sister institutions into the neighborhood life; private landlords have begun modernizing their structures. Attention has also been paid to small things and sand boxes and benches installed along a parkway where mothers with their small children may enjoy the shade during a summer afternoon.

We hope that the leadership which has been available to Morningside Heights will be used in other neighborhood renewal programs. The State Division of Housing is anxious to cooperate, but the job must be initiated by the City itself—through its appropriate agencies with the support of the Mayor and Board of Estimate.

The State Division, in extending aids to the people whose incomes are between eligibility to public housing and ordinary private housing, has to encourage co-operatives. Limited-profit rental projects are sponsored by builders or housing companies but co-operatives are

something else. If there is not a central co-operative housing organization to play the same role in co-op housing as the local housing authorities do for public housing, we will have very few co-ops in conjunction with urban renewal or anywhere else. It is too much to expect potential members of a co-op housing development to become experts in city planning, design, engineering, and the like just to get a dwelling. As co-ops can achieve a lower rent than limited-profit rental developments—if for no other reason because they do not pay a six percent profit on equity—the State as a matter of policy must find a way to get them built without the agony of organizing each project from scratch.

In New York City we have had considerable experience with co-operative housing and in recent years an organization to do this job has emerged. The United Housing Foundation has behind it over 30 years successful building and management of large co-operative developments beginning with the Amalgamated projects sponsored by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the International Ladies Garment Workers. Other unions have also sponsored co-operatives, the most notable being Electchester, by the A.F. of L. Electricians and the employees and Harry Silver Houses, by the Butcher's Union. These projects, the veterans co-ops built under Section 213 of the National Housing Act, other co-ops, labor unions and public interest groups formed the United Housing Foundation.

We in the State Division of Housing feel it preferable for co-ops to be sponsored, built and managed with the aid of such a democratically controlled organization as the U.H.F. rather than directly by the State or public housing authorities. The State may aid in the financing and give supervision and help; but the initiative ought to be from the co-operatives and unions themselves. Co-operative housing, after all, is a form of private home ownership.

The Division deals also with the smaller cities of the State, but we find many of these cities have not yet set up or have only weak city planning programs. The whole Title I and urban renewal programs are quite new to them. In regard to these cities the State departments, principally the Division of Housing, finds it must provide leadership and delineate the problems before tripart co-operation among the city in question and the State and Federal governments is possible. We have had several somewhat disillusioning experiences here as these cities are not necessarily ready to consider a program of using State funds to get a larger share of Federal Title I funds to solve local problems. We had one city reject our suggestion of using our off-site funds as part of a larger project to modernize their central business district in favor of a revision of the local zoning ordinance. It is obvious in such cases it's not a question of the State refusing power to a city or barring it from access to the Federal government's largess. This is a horse that must be dragged to the water. We can, however, report we have the bridle on and have

started a slow movement toward the drinking trough.

Because of this situation, we have cleared two 314 programs with the Federal government. The first is a study of a State-wide housing code which may be adopted by reference by the cities of the State. We have a State Building Code but no State recommended standards as to occupancy, room sizes, and other amenities to guide the urban renewal programs which are now in the discussion stage.

The second State-wide 314 program is an over-all development study of a typical upstate New York city. We intend to study this city to find out what can be done with the present city planning tools. The Kestnbaum Report has suggested the time has come to stop thinking on an *ad hoc* basis about our various housing and city planning problems: the slum clearance problem, the school building problem, the spread of the suburbs problem, the central business district problem and start thinking of the urban metropolitan region. This is what we want to do in our survey.

Of these results not the least may be a study of the relationships of the State to its cities. We in the Division of Housing have been forced more and more into all aspects of city planning to protect the increasingly large investment of the State in urban real property. The Division began under Clarence Stein as a state regional planning agency but this fruitful beginning was nipped in the bud and its present history begins as a public housing agency. However, as the Division grew it had to concern itself with the city planning aspects of public housing: the location of the site in regard to the district and the city as a whole; its relation to transportation, to employment, to schools, to zoning, to shopping. Since I took over the direction of the Division in January, 1955, its policy has been to concern itself with housing in its most comprehensive sense. In many instances we must advise smaller cities more and more in regard to their total city planning problems and hence we hope the study of a typical city will indicate how the State can best supply the need for professional city planning advice to the cities which our experience has proved necessary.

Here I believe the States have a very real role. As long as the cities look to the state legislatures for their charters, the State will have a very large role in city planning which cannot be taken over by the Federal government. This is the other side of the right of the cities to contract directly with the Federal government. I suspect this right is only exercised fully by relatively few great cities; for the rest our experience is probably typical—the cities have to be induced to use the aid offered and a constant review of state legislation is necessary.

Hence, there remains in the fields of housing and urban planning a need for government between the Federal and City levels. The experience of the Division of Housing in New York State indicates that an agency fulfilling this need will make Federal aids more effective.

Federal Aid to Local Government

HON. DAVID L. LAWRENCE, Mayor, Pittsburgh, Pa.

IT WAS in June of last year that the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations delivered its "Report to the President for Transmittal to the Congress." With attachments, it weighed about five pounds and came to fourteen volumes.

As the mayor of a large American city, I believe the circumstance gives me the right to pick up the line that Tennessee Ernie has made so famous, and to lament like his coal miner:

"Fourteen volumes and what do we get?
Another year older and deeper in debt!"

The Commission's report passed into obscurity like an old boot settling into a mud flat. It has made little impression on the country, although it was the first officially authorized consideration of intergovernmental relationships in this nation since the Constitutional Convention met in 1787.

That is because it said nothing very memorable. Perhaps, as we shall see, there was nothing much to say.

As was foreordained, the Report disappointed those who hoped that the advent of a Republican national administration would wipe out "big government" at Washington, eliminate the whole system of Federal grants-in-aid, withdraw the national government from every welfare field, and return us to such an imagined states-rights society as even John C. Calhoun never saw in practice.

There was no comfort in the report for the school of thought which not only wants to *take* the Government out of business, but wants to go further and *put* the Government out of business. They did better with the Hoover Commission.

The truth, for good or ill, is that the processes of history are irreversible. We have a vastly complex society. It cannot be operated by a skeleton of government. On the other side of the coin, the cautious report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations recommended no great changes in the assignment of public responsibilities; no sweeping constitutional amendments; no fixed allocation of public revenue sources to the various levels of government; nothing very drastic anywhere.

The report pretty much accepted the *status quo*—sometimes with polite hand-wringing, sometimes with muted pleasure; always with diplomacy of phrase, always with an evident enjoyment in the restatement of the obvious. So we all find ourselves just where we were before this survey—this survey which will never mark an epoch.

We are in a great unsystematic tangle, in which there is no general

rule or order, but in which can be found some specific solutions. The Federal government has not withdrawn, to my knowledge, from a single area in which it had been a participant with the States and cities. The arguments based on the principle of Federal grants are largely forgotten. The disputes that recur are on "How?" and even more, "How Much?"

I think that we can all admit that the place a man occupies inevitably colors his thinking in the area of governmental relationships. The Mayor sees the city government as the low man on the totem pole, the maltreated creature of an unfeeling State, the victim of jealous and selfish suburbs, a recipient of the revenue dregs after the Federal government and the state government have drained the cup of all the good and nourishing tax sources. It is very easy for a municipal official to develop an advanced case of self-pity.

The man at the state capitol is convinced, on the other hand, that he alone takes the broad view. The State has constitutional sovereignty. It encompasses city and suburb, small town and farm. A Governor can quickly see himself as the valiant antagonist of Federal encroachment, holding fast for our ancient liberties. Or as the guardian of the traditional rural virtues, threatened by the equally traditional vices of the great city. It is very easy for a Governor to become sure that only he and his administration are able to apportion justly public funds within a State.

The Federal administrator, with money to disburse, can quickly take on the more unpleasant attributes of Cato the Censor. The money is a means of enforcing pet dogmas on those who would receive it. Only the Federal agency is pure and well motivated. State governments, the Federal man will admit, are notoriously shoddy; municipal officials are venal at worst, and not so bright at best. And there is always the haunting fear of what you will tell the Congressional Committee if things go wrong somewhere. It is very easy for the Federal official to become so gun-shy, he is useless; if it is a case of being safe rather than sorry, he'll be so safe that his program never gets off the ground.

These are all extreme statements of position, extreme to the point of parody. But even allowing for their extremes, they contain some germ of truth, some inkling of the problems that are inherent in our system of government.

It is the sad truth that in many matters, the facts of our public life resist all logic.

We instead, take a compound of tradition, of emotion, of personalities, of inherited structure and classic dogmas—and strangely, we improvise a way to make them work.

It would be logical, I am sure, to devise a Constitutional Amendment which would apportion tax resources equitably in ratio to responsibilities assumed by the Federal Government, the States, and the municipalities.

It would be logical to revise state constitutions, so that public ad-

ministration in our States could advance with the general advances in our society, and so that residents of the several States would be fairly represented in their own legislative bodies. It would be logical to consolidate metropolitan areas into sensible units for effective local government.

None of these things are being done. Instead, we must temporize, improvise, and play it all by ear. We take the rules of the game; we learn to live within them; and by common consent, we find where they can be shaded and interpreted so that we do what we must.

The French epigram says that politics is the art of making possible that which is necessary. We are better at it than the French who coined the phrase.

It is necessary to draw upon Federal assistance in the work of slum clearance, low-rent housing, and urban redevelopment. Accordingly, we establish and accept a direct city-national relationship and by-pass the state governments which are so largely indifferent, if not hostile, to the public aspects of the problem.

It is found that the state highway departments are ignoring the vital approaches to our metropolitan centers. No one suggests that the States be removed from the field of highway construction in which, by the facts of geography alone, they are the primary agent. Instead, the Federal-aid program is so amended that the pattern of Federal assistance compels the States to pay attention to the most critical of our traffic needs.

By its emphasis on the inter-state highway system, the Federal government will strongly protect the interests of urban areas in the expanded program which is before the Congress.

By and large, throughout the country, airports are a city or county responsibility. Federal aid comes directly to them in recognition of the fact that the States have earned no conspicuous place in the map of air transportation.

Regional planning is a direct Federal-local relationship. So is the development of a shelf of public works.

The whole thing is enough to give a political scientist the shudders and send a management consultant to his aspirin bottle. As people dedicated to planning, even you and I may have our qualms.

But, underneath the disorder, the thing makes sense. We recognize those areas where the municipal government is the principal agency of administration, and we make sure that if the State won't help, at least it won't get in the way.

In government, as we have said, we should always remember that we are not dealing with precision instruments and an exact science. We have constant reference, not to structure alone, but to personalities and philosophies. Public officials, despite the cynics, very often believe—or come to believe—what they say in their campaign speeches.

There are deep traditional alignments in our politics, county by county, state by state, region by region.

It is not a partisan observation to point out that Democratic officials, these past twenty years, have had fewer mental blocks to overcome than Republicans in advocating, accepting, and administering Federal-aid programs.

Outside of the South, few Democrats are fearful of the use of national powers to solve national problems. In our eastern and central States, the cities tend to be centers of Democratic strength, while Republican strength is concentrated in the suburbs and small towns. The wheel of political fortune therefore determines, to a great extent, the degree of consideration which urban problems receive in the state administration. That is not said to assign credit or blame; it is simply a political fact.

At the moment, the spinning of the wheel has given us a more than normal grouping of state administrations to whom urban problems are of vital interest. New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut are very highly urbanized. It will be interesting to see what changes, if any, in the relationship of State and city occur under their present administration. Obviously, as cities feel more secure in their respective States, they will be less jealous of their direct approach to Washington.

There is one area of Federal and local relationship which I have not yet mentioned. That is the work of civil defense.

In my judgment, we have no system of civil defense, nor will we have one so long as we attempt to hold to the lines of customary civil administration. It is blind folly to believe that any efficient system can possibly be developed through a multiplicity of local units, the governments of forty-eight states, and a vague and ineffective civilian agency of the national government. What we have may be a useful instrument for a flood or local disaster. It would collapse at the first warning of real attack. The defense of the civilian life of the country is as important in modern war as the defense of its armed forces in being.

We should stop playing games, and make civil defense a part of the Defense Department, as the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are part of that department. It should be a wholly national responsibility. But we pray that we will have no war, and that the work of constructing and advancing this society of ours will not end in the chaos of a ruined world.

As we look into the bright area of our future, we see a continuous process of expansion in the American economy. We have accepted the thesis that it is the duty of society to keep its productive men and women at work. We have an expanding population, rising living standards, new peaks of productivity and real income.

In such a society, our errors will come when we underestimate. It seems as though there are things which you cannot over-build—air-

ports, highways, parking facilities. Nor can you over-build the new cities of America. Our people have seen miracles come to pass in our technology. They will expect miracles of those of us who are their servants in the re-fashioning of American cities. Nor do we have eternity before us.

These problems of cities, the problems of urban living, are in the present; they must be solved in our own time. We cannot afford to be dogmatic. We cannot afford to draw flow charts of Federal funds and argue that we, in the industrialized States and the large wealth-producing cities, would be better off if our money stayed at home.

We are a Nation, not a confederacy. We need national programs in our urban problems, as we need national programs in the conservation and wise use of our natural resources.

As the mayor of a large city, which is in turn the capital of a great industrial complex, I am sure that our economy will flourish only as the Nation flourishes.

I believe in a rising standard of community life, in better planning, in wiser land use, in greater productivity across the face of America. We ask for more than paper programs from our national government. We ask for zeal, for perseverance, for imagination, for bold action. I am sure those same qualities will be matched, even as they are given, in the vibrant cities of America.

Urban Renewal and Local Planning

JAMES W. FOLLIN, Commissioner of the Urban Renewal Administration,
Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C.

ONE of the basic prerequisites of successful urban renewal is sound general planning.

The general plan, in effect, is the foundation on which the superstructure of urban renewal undertakings must be erected. Plans for urban renewal areas, under the Housing Act of 1954, must conform to the general plan for the community as a whole. Major Federal aids for urban renewal, therefore, are not possible unless there is an adequate general plan.

The extensive urban blight is due in part to faulty planning, or no planning at all, in years gone by. If communities fail now in carrying on sound general planning, they will succeed in compounding the mistakes of the past. And continuation of previous planning errors will hand down to other generations the same troublesome—but worsened—problems we face today.

The workable program concept of the Housing Act of 1954 is a new and important prerequisite to the major Federal urban renewal aids authorized by the Act. The workable program—comprising seven objectives to which the community must commit itself—lays heavy emphasis not only on a general plan, but also on neighborhood analyses. Such analyses are needed to identify the blighting influences so you may plan for their correction. These two objectives must go hand in hand, since the urban renewal plan for any neighborhood actually becomes a part of the general plan.

Obviously, close collaboration is necessary between the local planning agency and the urban renewal agency. The ideal situation is where general planning stays well ahead of urban renewal project planning. Unless this is so, it might be wiser to delay urban renewal projects until the essential elements of the general plan are up-to-date. Lasting effectiveness of the general plan depends on how well the locality keeps it up to date.

Urban Planning Assistance

TRACY B. AUGUR, Director of Urban Planning Assistance,
Urban Renewal Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency,
Washington, D. C.

WHEN the Congress enacted the comprehensive Housing Act of 1954 it included among its provisions a short paragraph headed "Urban Planning" which authorized the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make grants-in-aid, on a matching basis, (1) to State planning agencies to aid them in providing planning assistance to small municipalities and (2) to official State, metropolitan or regional planning agencies for urban planning work in metropolitan and regional areas.

Thus, in one brief paragraph, the Congress inaugurated a new Federal policy toward cities, a policy of financial aid for the constructive planning of small municipalities (under 25,000) and the urbanized regions and metropolitan areas where the rapid pace of urban expansion is creating such diverse and serious problems all across the Nation.

Why did the Congress inaugurate this new policy? The most immediate basis for it was the recommendation in President Eisenhower's Housing Message of January 1954 that such aid be provided "to enable smaller communities and metropolitan planning agencies to do the planning job which is necessary to arrest the spread of slum conditions." Planning was considered a preventive measure, to help forestall the creation of urban slums and blight by getting at one of their causes in the areas where new urban structure is being formed.

The President's recommendation was, in turn, based on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Government Housing Policies and Programs which he had appointed in the Fall of 1953 to review the whole question of Government policy toward housing.

Thus the new policy evolved from a concern with housing and city slums. But, like most matters of national policy, it had other roots, too. The Federal Government has long been a big investor in cities. Federal money has gone not only into city housing and slum clearance and urban redevelopment, but also into city streets and water systems and school buildings and hospitals and a dozen other things.

Too often these Federal financial aids have been spent unwisely because there was no adequate plan of local development to guide them. It is just plain good management on the part of the Government to stimulate the production of the general community and metropolitan plans needed to protect the Federal investment.

Then, too, there is a concern at all levels of government for the economic stability of cities. If they are in economic distress, the load is felt all up the line. Progressive businessmen and industrialists are increasingly unwilling to risk their capital on new enterprises in cities that are inefficient or down at the heel. "If you want to attract in-

dustry," says the Massachusetts Secretary of Commerce, "you have to be attractive." So sound city planning is coming to be recognized as essential to sound economic development.

These are some of the roots of the new Federal policy and they are nurtured in the soil of increasing nationwide urbanization, in the fact that the United States has now completed the change from a predominantly rural nation to a predominantly urban one, with 80 to 90 percent of its new population growth flowing into its most congested metropolitan areas.

As befits a new born policy, Federal aid for local planning had a modest start. The Congress authorized a total of five million dollars in grant funds and, of that total, three million has thus far been appropriated. The President asked in his recent State of the Union message that the authorization be increased.

Growth of the infant program has been slow, to the distress of parents, guardians and interested friends and relatives. It has learned to walk and has learned that the path of progress is beset with unexpected and annoying obstacles, but it has also learned that most of the obstacles can be overcome.

As of February 1, grants to aid States in providing planning assistance to small municipalities had been made to 7 State planning agencies for assistance to 76 municipalities. The total Federal commitment was \$220,186 and the States put up an equal amount.

The largest grant for this purpose was \$87,509, to the Connecticut Development Commission to help it give assistance to 14 communities damaged by the floods of last August. The smallest grant was \$6,185, to the University of Arkansas, which is carrying on a modest planning assistance program on a limited budget. The Arkansas legislature granted the University authority to serve as the State planning agency for this purpose.

Additional grants have been made to 2 state planning agencies to help them perform planning work in 3 urbanized regions. One, the first made under this program, went to the Rhode Island Development Council for planning work in the urbanized shore region affected by the 1954 hurricanes. The other was made to the Connecticut Development Commission for planning in two of the river valleys hardest hit by the 1955 hurricanes. The total Federal commitment for this work was \$84,200, of which Rhode Island received \$16,000 and Connecticut the rest. In each case the State matched the Federal grant.

Finally, grants for planning work in metropolitan and regional areas have been made to 7 official metropolitan or regional planning agencies in 5 States, for a total commitment of \$196,960. The Detroit region received the largest grant, \$35,000, for this purpose and the Baton Rouge area the smallest, \$16,875. The recipient in each case puts up matching funds.

Altogether, as of February 1, 1956, grants totaling \$501,346 had been made to 7 State planning agencies and 7 metropolitan or regional planning agencies, a total of 16 grants distributed among 11 States. Two State planning agencies had received grants both for planning assistance to municipalities and for regional planning.

Applications are now being processed for an almost equal number of grants, with a total amount comparable to that already committed. Furthermore, there is a steady flow of correspondence, telephone calls and visits indicating that other applications are being prepared or that amendments to State legislation are being pushed so that they may be eligible.

It is still far too early to judge the full effect of this program, but there is enough evidence to claim success for one of its primary objectives, namely, the stimulation of urban planning by the States and by official metropolitan and regional planning agencies. The stimulus is in the form of an offer to match any funds that an eligible planning agency will put up to carry on qualified planning work.

The earliest agencies to take advantage of this offer were, of course, those that were already in business, that had the needed authority under their State laws and that had funds with which to match a Federal grant. To them, Federal aid meant an expansion or an acceleration of work already programmed. But many applications and many more inquiries are being received from planning agencies that either did not exist when the program started or that were inactive or too poorly financed to do effective work. The stimulus of Federal financial aid is working, if one can judge from the country-wide interest that is being aroused in qualifying for it.

Not enough planning work has yet been performed under this program to judge its effectiveness in arresting the spread of slum conditions. It was first necessary to set up the planning machinery at the State and local level through which the problem could be tackled. And it should be noted that the program aims at stimulating the establishment of planning machinery in the areas where it is now most lacking, in the smaller communities that are not apt to have their own planning agencies operating on a metropolitan basis are still rare.

There have been and still are a number of annoying roadblocks that hold the program in check. Many States having state planning and development agencies have not clothed them with power to render technical planning assistance to the municipalities of the State. Many, too, restrict their expenditures to funds appropriated by the Legislature and thus automatically prevent acceptance and use of Federal grants. These difficulties are being overcome through State legislative amendments, but that takes time.

Another roadblock, and one that threatens to become more serious, is the shortage of qualified planning personnel. The profession of city

planning is still small numerically and annual additions to its ranks are limited. The supply is not growing as rapidly as the demand. It is, of course, encouraging that the demand is growing. It is also encouraging that this is resulting in an upgrading of planning salaries to more nearly adequate levels. But there is also a lot of shifting of personnel from one locality to another for what appear to be more promising positions, with loss to the continuity of the planning work.

To correct an impression that we frequently find among those interested in this program, let me interject a comment here about the use of technical consultants. As far as the Federal Government is concerned it makes no difference whether a State or local planning agency utilizes its own technical staff or contracts with outside consultants or organizations, so long as the persons performing the work are qualified to do so. The point on which the Government does insist is that the official body to which it makes a grant is itself qualified to administer a sound planning program.

As a matter of fact there is wide variation in the way the planning agencies participating in the program are handling the problem of technical personnel. In Alabama and Tennessee there is a long tradition on the part of the State planning agencies to maintain a qualified technical staff on their own payrolls. In other States, the work is being handled largely through contracts with private consultants and in some cases both methods are used by the same agency. When the floods hit Connecticut, a Mr. Clark will tell you tomorrow, the Connecticut Development Commission placed a large panel of private consultants on its payroll and made their services available free to the flood-stricken areas.

In closing, just a word about the way in which this program is administered. The administration was assigned by Housing Administrator, Albert M. Cole to the Urban Renewal Administration, under Commissioner James W. Follin. The program is headed by a Director of Urban Planning Assistance on Mr. Follin's staff.

For the first year or so, while policies and procedures were being developed, administration was centralized in the Washington Office. Beginning last August, preliminary contacts between prospective applicants and the Housing Agency were decentralized to the six HHFA Regional Offices.

The process of decentralization is continuing and it is anticipated that in the near future all of the processing of applications and the administration of grants will be handled through the Regional Offices. The actual allocation of funds will remain a responsibility of the Washington Office as will certain other functions, but agencies seeking or operating under Federal grants will deal almost entirely with the Regional Offices.

Commercial and Industrial Redevelopment

MAX S. WEHRLY, Executive Director, Urban Land Institute,
Washington, D. C.

I SUPPOSE I have been asked to discuss commercial and industrial redevelopment because of the interest and leadership the Urban Land Institute has contributed in these fields in past years and because of my own personal view that they are the two most important ingredients in this new and broader concept of what we now call urban renewal, if not in city survival.

I am convinced without them urban renewal can well inherit the label once given by former President Hoover to Prohibition—"A noble experiment"—which failed. Unless we are willing to scrap completely the concept of a relatively free economy for that of a police or welfare state, we must be prepared to accept the fact that not only do rapid technological change and ways of doing things induce rapid deterioration and obsolescence in our physical urban structure but that we are now in a period of history where our local and national economic strength rests predominantly in our urban areas and there, in the health and vigor of our commercial and industrial activity which has reached its present stature through the free economic process.

It is the post-war acceleration of technological change and our increasing dependence on a healthy urban economy that make the need for modernizing our commercial and industrial plant so urgent; and I am not referring so much to the structure enclosing commercial or industrial activity as to the ability of the activity to function in terms of location and space.

Let us look first at commercial activity which for our purposes here will be confined to retail trade. Here our problem is often not so much a matter of redevelopment—i.e. area clearance and rebuilding—as it is of rehabilitation and conservation. The fact that the cities, the building owners and the merchants have in the past been complacent to the point of inaction does not change the fact that virtually every city in the U. S. depends upon its central business district to produce anywhere from 15 to 30 percent of its total real property tax revenue. Twenty percent is probably a fair average. Nelson and Aschman found that the additional established commercial shopping districts, exclusive of the *Loop* or central retail district of Chicago, did an annual business of over a billion dollars, employed 60,000 people and paid annual wages in excess of \$133 million, producing an assessment for tax purposes alone of more than \$200 million. It is universally true that tax revenues from both central and outlying business districts are considerably more than sufficient to pay for the municipal services they require and receive. With but few exceptions, this cannot be said of the residential areas of our cities.

Since the importance of the established retail district—both central and outlying—is indisputable, it is essential that the conservation and rehabilitation of these assets form an important part of any renewal or redevelopment program not only to protect and encourage investment but to retain municipal solvency and preserve the integrity of the residential areas. The excess of tax revenue over municipal expenditure on business district servicing is one of the keys to neighborhood conservation, since it helps pay for the all-important services demanded by residential areas but seldom if ever paid for by them on a self-supporting basis.

The dramatic development of the integrated Shopping Center since 1946 has misled some people to look upon this trend as “urban disintegration or decentralization.” What we have been witnessing, however, is a strong centralizing trend which has caused our urban areas to grow at four times the rate of the country as a whole, plus a regrouping of retail and other commercial uses toward a more rational pattern to serve this growth and meet new methods of travel and communication. In this process, the only type of commercial development that is being, and need be, hurt substantially is that scattered along the old lines of street railways. Here is a redevelopment problem of no small proportions, but new and more appropriate uses will eventually be found for these string developments. The relatively compact and well located downtown center and the established sub-centers will and should remain, not only for the economic support of the community but as a necessary service and convenience facility for the surrounding residential areas. But they must have their proper share of any renewal program if they are to continue to serve these functions to best advantage. I would suggest that anyone interested in this aspect of the urban redevelopment field will find the study by Nelson and Aschman, published as Technical Bulletin 22 by the Urban Land Institute, worth reading.

Now let us look at the question of industrial redevelopment. Here the basic reasons relating to the economic and employment base of the community are similar to those present in commercial and retail trade, but the details are different. I might say here that the term *industrial* does not denote factories belching smoke and fumes, but includes a wide range of economic activity such as distribution facilities, warehousing, research laboratories, and many others. Industry's needs are many and varied and the sad fact is that many cities and their citizens are responsible for driving industry into the hinterland or out of their area altogether through restrictive zoning or other methods, which puts in the industrial district land “not good for anything else”; by not protecting industrially zoned land from the intrusion of other uses; by not recognizing the legitimate need for existing industries to expand in their present locations. I recall a remark made by a young city planner in one of our medium size cities when this question of expansion

of a certain plant onto suitable contiguous land was being considered. He said in effect: I am not interested in what happens to the industry; my job is to protect the residential areas. Apparently there were enough people of the same mind, which left this particular industry with one alternative—to move out lock, stock and barrel to another city.

In pursuing the redevelopment quest, we have been too prone to look at the residential slums and visualize bright new housing arising on the site—a commendable vision, but one without regard for the fact that the particular area may long since have lost any suitability or justification for its perpetuation in residential use.

Despite all the agitation there has been for dispersal—even to the point of inability to produce, there is a definite and sizable market for centrally located industrial land—land which can be created through the redevelopment process; land which is no longer suitable for residential use but which already has accessibility by mass transit, road and rail; land with proximity to hotels, offices, printing plants, is central to its metropolitan market; land that has water, sewer, gas and electricity in adequate quantities; and most important, land that has a surrounding pool of labor upon which to draw and which will remain as a producing and consuming element in the city—a most vital element, by the way, in the community's struggle for economic solvency.

There are, of course, a great many things that must be done besides merely clearing a site of old buildings to make it attractive to industry. This will require the best thought and effort on planning and rebuilding other outmoded elements serving the area, in analyzing the type of community you have in terms of its plus and minus qualities for any given type of industrial activity; and most importantly, in creating a favorable climate for the industry which today is not locating by guess and by gosh, but is analyzing your city in terms of your local politics, your financial record, your schools, churches, housing, and labor supply. A sound municipal budget is more important to a good industry today than a temporary tax exemption. A factual and clearly presented analysis of your city's assets and liabilities counts more than a beautiful promotional brochure; and a good, available and well-located site may swing the balance.

The 1954 Housing Act, establishing the Urban Renewal Division in HHFA, was a forward step in recognizing that urban redevelopment is something more than housing—a fact that the earlier legislation ignored. The present law still can and should be improved greatly in this respect, and I believe the present officials administering it would agree. But cities should not wait for this to happen before they take the initiative themselves in furthering the cause of redevelopment in the commercial and industrial field through local and state action. After all, they are only diminishing, or at best delaying, their own future prospects as a going municipal concern by waiting for Uncle Sam to do it.

Urban Redevelopment and the Economic Base

WILLIAM L. C. WHEATON, Professor of City Planning,
University of Pennsylvania

WITHIN the next two decades our cities will grow enormously. They will add 30 million people to their present population, \$200 to \$400 billions to their industrial plant and the housing, roads, and community facilities needed for this added population. But in addition to this construction for new growth, American cities will rebuild large parts of their older central areas. Our cities are going to be torn apart and rebuilt as a result of economic forces, technological influences, and public policies.

Since we are now building the roads, utilities, and housing and other structures for these future cities we might ask ourselves a few questions. Do we know how much land will be needed for future industrial development in central areas now being redeveloped? How much of future industry is likely to be located in suburban areas now being filled with housing? Will highway systems planned to serve old, compact cities serve future lower density cities as well? What proportions of industrial, commercial and residential land uses will be needed to provide a sound tax base for municipal services? How will automation affect the employment patterns of future cities?

During the prewar period the Federal Government provided essential leadership for cities through research on urban problems. In the postwar period it has provided very large aids and incentives for housing and urban redevelopment, highways, industrial location and relocation, hospitals and the like. But neither the Federal Government nor any local government has any clear idea of how these aids are affecting the economic base of cities. It is time we knew. The Federal Government has a real obligation to explore some of these questions as a service to cities.

Some of the most important problem areas requiring attention appear to me to be the following:

1. What are the current trends in industrial location, and how are these being affected by Federal tax, dispersal, purchasing and power policies?
2. How are present Federal policies regarding urban redevelopment and housing affecting urban land use. Will they leave enough space either in redeveloped areas or in suburban areas for future industry needed by the community.
3. How are present and prospective highway programs likely to affect the pattern of cities, and the pattern of industrial development?

4. What are the major technological trends in industry? How will these affect location, employment, investment and other aspects of industrial development?

5. What are the prospective future volumes of activity by industry and by region which cities must be prepared to accommodate?

Our cities are the factories of the Nation. If we expect our income and wealth to grow, and this is our settled national goal, we should be paying more attention to urban problems than we have in recent years.

Area Development Programs

VICTOR ROTERUS, Director, Official Area Development,
Dept. of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

Local Community Activities. Nearly 5,000 Chambers of Commerce in the United States spend a large portion of their energies and their moneys promoting community development. Almost every railroad, light and power company and many banks have active industrial development departments designed to assist productive firms to settle or expand within their particular operating areas. In addition, during the past half century, over 2,000 privately owned and operated industrial development corporations or foundations, financed by private citizens, have been incorporated in the United States. Most of these latter groups are prepared to offer significant financial assistance in the form of loans or outright grants to new industries moving in, or to already established local industry in the process of expanding, or in some few cases, they will cultivate home grown industries.

With the assistance of liberal state laws and capable state development agencies, the industrial development departments or councils or committees of city government, active in many regions of the country—including New England and California, the Mountain States and the South—have attracted industry to their communities by developing a favorable industrial climate, influencing passage of realistic zoning regulations, creating a reasonable tax structure, providing the municipal services required by industry and its employees, and by making these communities attractive places in which to live and raise a family.

State Development Programs. Of the 48 States, 46—plus Alaska, Hawaii and Puerto Rico—have an official agency devoting its attention to area development matters. Each of these organizations stands ready to assist local communities in their development activities. Eleven States permit municipalities to finance factory construction through bond issues; eleven grant new industry temporary relief from real estate taxes. Eight States have formed Development Credit Corporations, while eight others are seriously considering their formation.

The recent industrial foraging trips of the Governors of Florida, Tennessee, West Virginia and Alabama have received wide publicity while the programs of many other States are advertised in magazines or newspapers from coast to coast.

Federal Assistance Programs. The Office of Area Development has been set up in the Department of Commerce as a central clearing house of information for state planning and development agencies. This Office distributes memoranda on subjects of current interest to assist state agencies in applying Federal data and services to their particular problems; it conducts an annual conference at which problems of mutual interest are discussed; it prepares technical publications on various aspects of industrial development programs; it publishes a bimonthly periodical to call attention to applicable Federal programs and to list current sources of information and data; and in cooperation with state development agencies and on request, it advises communities on specific courses of action to be followed in planning and implementing a development program.

Other Federal agencies also participate: The Departments of Labor, Agriculture and Interior, HHFA, SBA, REA, TVA and many others all make significant contributions toward improving a community's economic health and social well-being.

Our present, unparalleled national prosperity has been marred by pockets of chronic unemployment. To help alleviate this condition, several bills have been introduced during the present session of Congress. The more important of these is S. 2892, the Administration-backed measure known as the "Area Assistance Act of 1956," which is designed around four major principles: (1) helping communities help themselves; (2) providing lasting improvement of job opportunities by the establishment or expansion of productive industries; (3) requiring active financial participation of State or local governments or community-sponsored organizations; and (4) refusal of Federal aid to any community project that will create unemployment in some other area.

This bill, addressed to (1) aiding distressed areas where persistent and substantial unemployment exists (in towns like Wilkes-Barre, Pa., and Lawrence, Mass.) and (2) making technical and consultative assistance available to all communities, particularly those in low-income or underdeveloped areas, has as its main elements:

(1) Providing machinery in the Department of Commerce to bring together all available Federal assistance to focus more effective contributions toward solving distressed area problems. For example, the bill authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to give priority to applications received for Federal aid in financing needed community public facilities (sewers, water systems, etc.) and to make Urban Renewal Program benefits available for industrial redevelopment in those areas.

(2) An accelerated and enlarged technical assistance program to help areas of persistent and chronic unemployment revitalize their economic base. This will be done (a) through direct field consultations by experts from the Area Assistance Administration and (b) through encouraging State and local research on the industrial development potentialities of unemployment areas by means of modest grants of funds.

(3) Capital improvement loans to persistent unemployment areas to help local groups carry out their own economic development plans. Federal loans will be extended for (a) preparing land for industrial use, (b) constructing new factory buildings, or (c) modernizing existing facilities. These loans are not to exceed 25 percent of the aggregate cost of a project and will require that not less than 15 percent of such aggregate be supplied by the State or a political subdivision thereof or by a community organization.

Can We Afford Open Spaces in Metropolitan Areas?

FRED W. TUEMMLER, Fred W. Tuemmler and Associates
Community Planning and Development Consultants, Hyattsville, Maryland

Can we afford open spaces in metropolitan areas? I don't know if, before a group such as this, it is expected that the question, "Can we afford open spaces in metropolitan areas," will be seriously debated. I doubt if, in this assembly, we would be likely to find a proponent for the negative viewpoint. Perhaps we have set up this argument as a man of straw knowing full well that we will all rush into the fray, filling our throats with the worn and tattered battle cry ringing like the true cliché that it is. "Afford open spaces? We can't afford to be without them!" and then after demolishing the opposition and proving anew to ourselves, but unfortunately, too often, to no one else, that we need open space, we will retire smugly and with a righteous toss of our collective heads say, "So there. We have proven our point. Of course we need open space and *must* afford it."

Perhaps when I have concluded you will think that I have been harsh in my judgment of our shortcomings in our efforts to preserve open space. But remember that my assignment is, "Lessons to be Learned From A Case History." What I am about to say, therefore, will not have the flavor of approbation reserved for speeches given at a meeting of a mutual admiration society. I will point instead to our shortcomings and our failures. I will suggest, also, for your consideration several major areas for improvement so that we can attain our objectives. While we will use a local situation, the lessons to be learned and the

procedures suggested, with variation, can be applied elsewhere. For a case history, I ask you to look at the record of preservation of open space here in the Washington area.

Twenty-six years ago (1930) the Congress of the United States passed a farseeing piece of legislation now generally known as the Capper-Cramton Act, after its sponsors in the Senate and House of Representatives. This Act provided a magnificent opportunity to people in the District of Columbia and to the citizens in adjacent portions of the States of Maryland and Virginia to acquire and develop a park system on a grand scale.

The Capper-Cramton Act was unique in that Congress for the first time had recognized the responsibilities and obligations of the Federal Government to participate, through a system of loans and grants to the States of Maryland and Virginia in connection with the development of areas that would feel the direct impact of Federal City growth and expansion. The Act provided for the acquisition, establishment and development of the George Washington Memorial Parkway up the valley of the Potomac River from Mount Vernon on the Virginia side and Fort Washington on the Maryland side northwesterly upstream to Great Falls, and for the acquisition of lands in the District of Columbia, Maryland and Virginia requisite to the comprehensive park, parkway and playground system of the National Capital.

For the George Washington Memorial Parkway \$7,500,000 was authorized to be appropriated with the provision that no money should be expended until definite commitments had been received from the State of Maryland or Virginia or its political subdivisions for one-half the cost of acquiring the lands necessary for each unit in the project.

Four and a half million dollars was authorized to be appropriated for the park system in the Maryland portion of the Metropolitan District following the stream valleys of Rock Creek; the Anacostia River and its tributaries, Indian Creek, Northwest Branch and Sligo Creek; and the valley of Cabin John Creek. Another section of the Capper-Cramton Act authorized the expenditure of \$16,000,000 for parks, parkways and playgrounds in the District of Columbia. The passage of this Act was a tremendous achievement resulting from three years of hard work by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission which, in 1926 had been reconstituted from the National Capital Park Commission, and The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission created in 1927 by act of the Maryland General Assembly.

Twenty six years have passed since the Capper-Cramton Act became law. Let us look at the record of progress since then. How much of this great park system envisioned over a quarter of a century ago has been acquired and developed. Let us start with the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

In the section between Mount Vernon and Washington real progress

was made at once, the 1932 Bi-Centennial celebrating the birth of George Washington providing impetus for the program. This fifteen mile stretch of beautiful, river-front, scenic drive was an immediate example of the benefits to be derived from the Capper-Cramton Act, leaving one at a loss to understand the inertia or lack of interest on the part of Virginia officials in continuing the development northward through Arlington and Fairfax Counties to Great Falls. Now with the imminence of the development of the CIA site at Langley, the need becomes imperative. But the cost will be tremendous; many, many times what it might have been a few years ago. You can guess as well as I at the speculation which will skyrocket land values already high because of increases realized over the last quarter century of Washington's great growth.

Across the river on the Maryland side, there has been not a shred of progress on the Fort Washington Parkway along the Prince George's County waterfront between Fort Washington and the District of Columbia. The Government owns Fort Washington and Fort Foote, but not one acre of the 341 needed in addition has been acquired. Most of this area lies beyond the jurisdiction of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission and Maryland officials at State and County level have displayed the same apathy as their Virginia brethren.

Going to the plus side of the ledger, we find that north of the City most of George Washington Memorial Parkway in Montgomery County, between the District of Columbia and Great Falls has been purchased, 1700 acres having been acquired at a cost of about \$1,300,000. Development plans call for a scenic park drive; this has not been built although recently \$600,000 was made available to the Bureau of Public Roads for preliminary grading. Nevertheless it has taken 26 years to accomplish the program of acquisition. There is no road and much of the park area is in the same raw state as when acquired. So, summarizing, one-fourth of the George Washington Parkway is built, one-fourth more acquired and in about one-half there has been little or no progress because of local disinterest.

In the District of Columbia much greater success was achieved, the National Commission having acquired approximately 2,600 acres since 1924, bringing the total park, parkway and playground system to about 8,200 acres, lacking about 300 acres of the planned system.

Now let us examine the record of progress in the Maryland portion of the system for which the Congress authorized an appropriation of \$4,500,000. I have greater familiarity with the progress here and with the obstacles confronted making impossible the achievement of the magnificent objectives contemplated initially by the Capper-Cramton Act.

I stated that the \$4,500,000 authorized by Congress was for grants and loans. Of the total, \$1,500,000 was earmarked as a Federal con-

tribution and \$3,000,000 as a loan interest free for an eight year period, the amounts to be made available from time to time as units of the park system were established. In accordance with careful procedures, there was set up a basic agreement between the National Commission, representing the Federal Government, and its Maryland counterpart, representing the State. The money lent to the Maryland Commission was secured by Commission bonds guaranteed by the County in which that portion of the park system was located.

The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission is a bi-county agency and because of different tax policies in each County, there were differences in the authorization granted by the General Assembly with respect to acquisition and development. A debt ceiling limitation of \$1,200,000 was established in Montgomery County and \$800,000 in Prince George's County. A mandatory 7c park tax to provide funds for amortization of outstanding bonds and for park development was provided in Montgomery County, but in Prince George's County, while it was authorized, there was a further stipulation that the Commission obtain consent of the County Commissioners before applying for Capper-Cramton funds.

The program of park acquisition started with a rush, \$803,800 having been appropriated in 1931 for acquisition of portions of the system in Montgomery County. But it was six years (1937) before another appropriation was made by Congress. This time it was for \$200,000 again for additions to the Montgomery County part of the system.

It was about this time that Prince George's County officials began to awaken to their responsibilities and opportunities with the result that the appropriations of 1939 for \$300,000 and in 1942 for \$200,000 for Units I and II of Anacostia River Park went to Prince George's County. Thus in the first decade of its operation, Capper-Cramton appropriations totaled about \$1,500,000; \$500,000 of which represented the Federal contribution. By July 1942, the Commission had acquired 1,422 acres of land; about one-third of it in Prince George's County and two-thirds in Montgomery County.

There were no further appropriations during World War II. Understandably Congress had more important business on its hands than that of providing money for a park system, but right after the War's end, realizing the likelihood of great expansion that had been dammed up because of housing and transportation restrictions, the Commission set about on an ambitious program to purchase at once as much land as it could of the 7,700 acres still to be acquired. This included land in the valley of Oxon Run in Prince George's County and Little Falls Branch in Montgomery County, both of which had been added to the system by amendment in 1946 to the Capper-Cramton Act.

Despite repeated pleas for funds, the Commission's efforts were thwarted by Congress; the first meagre trickling coming in 1949 when a

token appropriation of \$159,000 was made after the Commission's General Counsel had reminded the Senate Committee that further postponement was tantamount to a repudiation by Congress of its solemn contractual obligations entered into with the Maryland Commission. There followed in 1950 and 1951 appropriations of \$498,000 and \$397,500 and then came another hiatus until 1955 and 1956, when a total of \$250,000 was made available. At present the Commission has pending for fiscal 1957 a request for \$343,000. Thus in twenty-five years, from 1931 to 1956, the Commission has had nine appropriations totalling \$2,808,300. Of this amount, \$999,000 has been repaid, \$483,000 will be repaid October 1, 1958, and \$220,000 October 1, 1959, which will mean a total repayment of \$1,702,000.

In the last two appropriations in 1955 and 1956, the Commission asked Congress for only the grant—not the loan—and this is true regarding the pending appropriation. By 1959, if the 1957 appropriation of \$343,000 is approved and another for \$109,000 is made in fiscal 1958, the Federal Government will have reached the limit of its grant of \$1,500,000 under the Capper-Cramton Act. But will the Maryland Commission have completed purchase of the contemplated park system by then? Not at all. The estimates in 1946 provided for a planned park system of 9,400 acres of which 1,500 had been acquired. The Commission estimates that by 1959, it will have acquired a total of approximately 3,200 acres. Since 1946, the Commission has lost irrevocably about 2,500 acres of the proposed park system which now stands at 6,900 acres. Why was it lost? Because the Commission had no funds to buy land which lay in the path of development. Almost every park had to be reduced in width, sometimes to a point where its value as a park is questionable since there is room for little more than the stream itself. Thus by 1959 the Commission will have achieved in twenty-nine years a little less than one-half of the curtailed program or one-third of the program anticipated in 1946.

By this time, rounding out nearly three decades, the Maryland portion of the Washington metropolitan area will have additional thousands added to those who have come here during the past period of great population increase. Most of you know of this growth, but it deserves emphasis, particularly in relation to the park acquisition and development program. Population growth figures are not available for the Metropolitan District to which the Capper-Cramton Park System is related, but in the Regional District, comprising about 294 square miles (as against 188 in the Metropolitan District), the population has increased from 72,000 in 1930 to an estimated 452,000 in 1955, a 527 per cent gain in the last twenty-five years. Assessed valuations, reflecting the tremendous increase in prices, have skyrocketed. Those of the past five years tell the story—showing an increase of 120 per cent. The 1956-57 estimate of assessed valuation in the Metropolitan District is \$1,087,-

000,000 compared with \$494,000,000 in 1951-52.

If by highlighting the failure to accomplish the objectives set forth in the Capper-Cramton Act you believe that I am critical of the Commissions, please let me assure you that I am not. Both the Maryland Commission and the National Commission did everything possible to achieve the objectives. The Maryland Commission, in its 1946 report entitled, "Program for Park Purchase," sought an immediate appropriation of the \$3,000,000 balance then available and indicated the need, stating in its report of September 18, 1946, to the Budget Bureau:

"During the War, when building construction, except for temporary war emergency housing, was at a standstill and transportation was curtailed to a very great extent by gasoline rationing, much of the population increase was concentrated in or close to the District of Columbia in Maryland and Virginia. The end of the War, the resumption of home construction; the pressing need for housing of returned veterans, many of whom have established new families; and that of the countless families who were using makeshift housing during the War, all have helped to create a sudden explosion in subdivision activity with an attendant rise in land values in areas adjacent to the District of Columbia, particularly those in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties.

"Much of the land desirable for subdivision in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties lies close to the major stream valleys that have been earmarked for inclusion in the park system under the Capper-Cramton Act. It now becomes urgently imperative for The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission to accelerate the tempo of its park acquisition program during the years immediately ahead.

"This accelerated program is required, not only to overcome the lag during War years and to catch up with the recreational requirements of a rapidly-expanded population within those years, but to insure the establishment of the planned park system in newly established communities and in stream-valley areas which are in the path of impending development and which will or may be lost forever, if acquisition is not undertaken at once or in the immediate future. It is with this thought foremost in mind that The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission submits herewith its estimate of the appropriations required in order to acquire those portions of the park system which are critical and which must be undertaken immediately."

But if that sounds prophetic, let me read to you from the first report of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission in 1927, which foretold unerringly the things that have come to pass:

"The Commission finds that in the quarter century since the McMillan Commission made its report, the area of park land in the District of Columbia has been increased only 24 percent, while the population has increased nearly 70 percent, and the assessed value of land 240 percent in the same period; that is, the increase of park area has been only about one-third of the increase of population for which the parks were intended and one-tenth as rapid as the increase in the value of land. Economically, the delay in acquiring land is therefore extravagant, as well as failing to provide for the needs of the population. The Commission estimates that if funds can be made available at a rate of \$2,000,000 to \$3,000,000 a year, the needs of the Capital for park land should be reasonably provided for in five years, after which appropriations could be reduced to what is necessary to provide for strictly local needs that cannot

now be foreseen. If the present rate of appropriations is adhered to, the cost of providing the needed park space will be very much greater and complicated by much more interference with private development; to proceed in this manner is uneconomical and therefore inadvisable. Not only will some of the land needed for parks cost many times as much in future years, as it increases in value and becomes covered with buildings or other improvements, but it will lose much of its desirability for park purposes by the destruction of beautiful forest trees and by being graded into flat uninteresting areas by real estate operators."

How true were both these forecasts of things to come!

But there's no time for hand wringing and lamentation. Let us look our collective selves right into our little red eyes and say, "O.K. We missed the boat—now how can we do better?" We still need this park system. What were our chief obstacles and how can we overcome them? Here are a few of the things I believe we need to do—

First we need to look at our plans, our objectives and our programs and evaluate them anew. Take the Maryland stream valley park system as an example.

Characteristic of all real estate, the stream valleys are fixed in location and the parks established there serve, except in rare instances, only the neighborhoods that are adjacent. There are many communities having no proximity to the stream valley parks, their people cannot use them. No wonder they don't get excited and rush out in support of the program. In Montgomery County, this shortcoming of the stream valley system was recognized about twelve years ago. Today the Montgomery County portion of the suburban area has about 500 acres of local recreation centers and playgrounds. Prince George's has only 64 and is in dire need of an expanded program because much of the suburban area is far removed from the stream valley system.

Perhaps we should give consideration, therefore, to amending the Capper-Cramton Act to provide not only for stream valley parks but for other parks and playgrounds requisite to the system of the National Capital Region as it did in the District of Columbia. You can bet that if every community were to be benefited, there would be strong, unified support.

Then, too, let's look at our development programs. They are way behind the need and understandably so. The Maryland Commission has been forced to divert funds which might have been used for development to park acquisition so as to protect the integrity of the system when Congress refused to grant funds.

But again, you can't get citizen support for a park system that will benefit the next or succeeding generations. People want their own kids to have a park and a playground and will go all out to help get it, but if afterward the area is a tangled jungle, becomes a roadside dump for litter and years pass before anything is done—well, you cannot win

friends and influence people that way. There is need for a happier balance between acquisition and development and right now need for a greatly accelerated program. People will pay for it—but they balk at spending a dime for something they can't use for ten years.

Second, we need to overcome the apathy and disinterest of local public officials in setting up the administrative machinery for the park acquisition and development program. Pressure from interested citizens groups will help to do this. This is a key block—for if you have no interest on the part of public officials, if you have no basic agreement such as that set up between the National and Maryland Commission, if there are no procedures for plan preparation, setting up of park units, acquisition and development—well—you just will not get anywhere. You cannot put the park on a spoon and shove it down someone's throat.

Third, there is need for doing a better job when requests for appropriations are submitted to Congress. Long, voluminous reports, while necessary to tell the story in detail, are less impressive than a bold technique—a real high-level sales campaign, *and* plenty of support from the citizens who will benefit by the park program. Just last week I saw a full-page ad in a Washington paper urging people to write their congressmen in opposition to the Natural Gas Bill. Have you ever seen similar technique used to support a park appropriation?

Fourth, we need a program of public education to get citizen support for these projects. There is no point in park people or planners telling each other that parks are needed, that open space should be preserved, that water sheds require stream valley protection and so on. There is need, however, to develop an organized program of education, sending speakers out to citizens' associations, P.T.A.'s, service clubs, to Chambers of Commerce and Boards of Trade and to real estate organizations, and getting hard core citizen committees dedicated to this job. Yes, and we need programs on television, too. Think of the outstanding job done recently in publicizing Potomac River pollution problems which has given impetus to programs intended to overcome this mess.

Fifth, we need to give ourselves a good injection of enthusiasm and get on with the job with the same fervor that was displayed when the work was started twenty-six years ago.

Remember, it took only two years, 1930 to 1932, from the time the Capper-Cramton Act was passed until the Washington Bi-Centennial, to accomplish the acquisition and much of the development of the Mount Vernon Memorial Parkway. It has taken twenty-six years just to acquire the land in Montgomery County—that's too long. The Federal Government acquired all the right-of-way for the Baltimore-Washington Parkway to Jessups in about two years, because it was faced with a deadline—the loss of the money if it weren't committed.

There have been unfortunate delays in acquiring land in Maryland,

too, after funds for units were made available. We need to get on with the show and stop dragging our feet. Planning, acquiring, developing and operating a park system is, or should be, a full-time job. If it's made a part-time assignment, the program suffers.

Sixth, (a) By 1959, when and if we ask Congress for a continuance of the Capper-Cramton Act and more funds to accomplish it, we should have, in as detailed form as possible, the plan for the entire system of parks, parkways *and* neighborhood playgrounds. We should seek not only an authorization, but a full appropriation of the amount of grant (assuming one-third is to be paid by the Federal Government) or an amount up to the level permitted by our debt ceiling.

(b) Our local authorized debt limit should be increased and expressed as a percentage of the assessable base rather than a fixed lump sum as is now the case. This should be accomplished before we go to Congress to request an extension of the Capper-Cramton Act.

(c) We should secure an amendment to our planning legislation authorizing under subdivision control the establishment of conservancy areas not only for stream valleys proposed for park acquisition but for all stream valleys requiring protection. This legislation should be supplemented by authorization for flood plain zoning so that building development can be kept out of areas subject to periodic inundation.

Another desirable amendment would be one to permit the Commission to acquire development rights in land, leaving the land in private ownership but limited to agriculture, forestry or some other type of open land use. I suggest this after reading population estimates for 1980-2000, indicating a growing together into a continuing urban agglomerate of the Washington-Baltimore metropolitan areas. Up in the State of New Jersey near the fringe of the New York Metropolitan Area, six counties are already working toward such a legislative program to insure the maintenance of permanent green areas.

But Progress is not born of contentment and so I have presented a verbal mirror to reflect the failures and the things undone. Let us, therefore, heed our lessons and set our faces toward the next twenty-five years with high hope and resolute spirit. Let us pick up our task anew, at once idealistically and practically and asking God's guidance pray that a quarter century hence when some of us will have turned the task over to others, there can be applied to our accomplishments the words of Ruskin which I have borrowed from General Grant's address on the occasion of the presentation in 1930 of the first Regional Plan for Washington and its environs,

"When we build, let us think we build forever. Let it not be for the present delight or for the present use alone. Let it be such work that our descendants will thank us for it and let us think, as we lay stone on stone, that a time is to come when those stones will be held sacred because our hands have touched them and that men will say, as they look upon the labor and the wrought substance of them, 'See this our fathers did for us.'"

Open Spaces and Our Exploding Cities

JOSEPH PRENDERGAST, Executive Director,
National Recreation Association, New York, N. Y.

LAST year many of you were present at the conference here which was on "Parks and Open Spaces." It was a very excellent conference and the problem of parks and open spaces was discussed in all ways—national, state, metropolitan and local. Now this week we have been having another very fine conference on cities—on our *exploding* cities. Put those two topics together and we have our topic this afternoon for discussion—*Open Spaces and Our Exploding Cities*.

So far, I have only found one person who really, truly appreciates how far and how fast our cities are exploding. It may be because this gentleman lives on Long Island and he is seeing what is happening to the little open spaces we have around New York City, or it may be that he is just ahead of his time. In any case, a few months ago he started to sell "acres on the moon." He was able to interest some 4500 people who wanted to buy "acres on the moon." He also interested another person who happened to be the Attorney General of the State of New York. He felt that the old racket of selling the Brooklyn Bridge was over. The thing which interested me in the whole incident was the fact that somebody in Baltimore wrote to him and tried to buy five acres of land on the moon for the Baltimore Parks Department. Now I happen to know, and I'm sure that many of you know, that Baltimore has a very fine Parks Department, and we've heard about the great progress being made in the County. So, I don't think it was because he felt that the Baltimore Parks Department didn't have enough space—simply that he realized that the growth of Baltimore, with Philadelphia on one side, Washington on the other side, New York on the other side, Atlanta on the other, and Chicago to the west—expansion must take place on the moon. Fifty years ago that would seem even more ridiculous than it does now, not only because our difficulty in getting to the moon was pretty far-fetched and we realized at that time that the whole distance that the Wright Brothers flew in 1903 is now just the exact length of the wing of a new B-52. We realized in 1903 that parks, open spaces and recreation areas were something that a few farsighted people knew about or were working for but something that was not generally accepted. So, now we see quite a change, quite a difference in that short period of time.

In relation to the open spaces in our exploding cities there are some facts that I believe have caused the cities to explode, and while they are all old facts to all of us, I do want to summarize very briefly some of them with the hope that perhaps later we will have a discussion about those many facts which I haven't mentioned. We all know these facts but they are not thought upon. Obviously, our cities are exploding be-

cause of the tremendous growth in our population. That's causing it—the explosion. In 1800 we had five million, in 1900, 76 million, 1903, 114 million, 1950, 151 million. We are now at 4 million persons a year. As a reflection, at this conference, for everyone that dies, three people are born. In 1981 we are facing some fantastic figures. Now these are the figures that are changing from time to time. We are now talking in terms of 221 million in the United States by 1975—250 million—300 million—nobody really knows. All we do know is that our population is growing tremendously, and will continue to grow tremendously.

Another item of importance in discussing open spaces in our exploding cities is the fact that the composition of our population is changing. It is changing in those age groups that need open spaces most close to their homes. Two age groups that are growing fastest in our population today are those under 14 and those over 65. Those under 14 cannot go too far away from home to go to playgrounds, sandlots and athletic fields or other places to play. Those over 65 cannot go too far away from home if they are going to have those quiet spots and lovely parks to walk, to sit, to play.

Those between 14 and 65, on the other hand, are those most capable of going some distance away for their golf, for their hunting, for their fishing, for their boating. These are some facts which I think we should take into consideration. The need for open spaces close to home to the two age groups—those under 14 and those over 65.

Another factor in this explosion is that our standard of living is going up so rapidly which means that more and more families can afford to go out to the suburbs, to own their own homes and get away from the crowded cities. That was not true a few years ago when our slums were even more crowded—people could not get away. They didn't have economic resources to move. Nor did they, as a matter of fact, have the desire or the wish to move.

But, now our constantly higher level of education is going up by leaps and bounds. The most amazing thing of our generation or of any generation is the higher level of education. People—all people—are not only going to elementary school or grammar school—they are going through high school. They are going to college. In my day a graduate of, even Princeton, had a pretty good chance of getting a job when he graduated. Now, it takes more than a B. A. degree, better than a Master's Degree, if you want a job. And that has a tremendous effect on the living conditions which people will tolerate. What does this mean? It means that our metropolitan areas are growing beyond belief. 97 percent of their growth in the last five years has been in the metropolitan areas—not in the rest of the country. And in the metropolitan areas—what's happening? It is not the central cities which are growing, it is the suburban areas that are growing, and it is my guess that what is causing this tremendous expansion is primarily the lack of open spaces in your

central cities. Open spaces mean peace of living. Peace of living means a place where you can raise your family—your children. Last year Ken Norton mentioned the fact that in another 10 years any man who lives in New York City (as our Chairman mentioned, I live in the very center of Manhattan Island which is the very center of the universe), it will take you a whole day of driving to get even outside to even see open spaces. So, my friends and your friends are moving out—they are becoming ex-urbanites, much to their regret. Many are coming back when they can. In New York City many industries have moved out, but many industries are now moving back again. They have found out that going out to the periphery, to the open spaces a million miles away is not the answer.

So, I feel that we cannot just wash our hands of the whole affair and say "Let the cities explode." "Let the people move out into the country." "Let the industries and businesses go out into the country." I believe we have the same problem to face in atomic science. If you let it explode, it'll be the end of everything; or we can control it. In the atomic pile, we have control rods. I suggest that we have a possibility of control rods of our own. I call those control rods "open spaces." Open spaces do not stop our exploding cities but will control them. And those open spaces are not any one kind or should be provided by any one agency. They should be all kinds—from the sandlot to the national park. City governments cannot be expected to provide all the open spaces needed in a community. Nor can the metropolitan areas, nor the county nor the state nor federal government. So, I repeat again what I repeated last year. All those agencies, all levels of all those governments, all those leaders, must find some way to get together and work out a policy, a plan, a program, where together we can have the open spaces of all the kinds, all the varieties, all the various sizes, so that our cities, as they explode, will be slowed down and the power which comes from the explosion will be directed to channels which will bring to America and to the world a "golden age."

Planning Ahead for Open Spaces

HERBERT H. SMITH, Executive Director,
Community Planning Associates, Inc., Princeton, New Jersey

THE NEED

There can be no question as to the need for planning ahead for open spaces.

There has been little done in this country on a major scale to prepare for the great growth of population and the spread of urban areas.

In New Jersey alone, we are losing farms and open areas to the suburban sprawl at the rate of five hundred tracts of five acres or more per year.

As to people—United States' population has reached 167 million. In five years it should be 178 million and in ten years 190 million. By 1975, there will be more than 220 million people who will live longer and have more leisure time.

As to children—Ten years from now, 23 percent more than today in elementary schools, 55 percent more in high schools and 40 percent more in colleges.

Even the great seer Robert Moses has the following to say:

"Today sound planning demands both play areas and small parks with facilities for all groups in or near housing subdivisions and slum clearance projects, and athletic fields at new schools shared by the education and park authorities."

THE TOOLS

We all know them. They are zoning, to control private development; subdivision controls, to shape new development; and master plans and capital budgets to provide for public areas.

Through these we should strive for:

Playfields and athletic fields

Playgrounds and parks

Play areas

Reservations and forests

Stream bed protection

How much do we need? All we can get and more, too.

THE PROBLEMS

Why haven't we been more successful? Why are we failing ourselves and our children? The tools are hampered by:

A deep-rooted attitude of personal interest and private exploitation.

Inadequate concepts of controls of private land and inalienable development rights.

Ineffectual national and state planning acts and programs for

aiding in providing open spaces in the metropolitan area.

An urban renewal program that places more stress on politically desirable distribution of grants than on truly effective community programs in order to earn the grants.

Weak-kneed, compromising local officials and planners that fail to fight for sound proposals.

Provincial and "holier than thou" school officials that refuse to recognize a nine-month facility as a year-round community potential.

WE NEED

Less self-styled experts and Park Commissioners who will leave no stone unturned to decry "comprehensiveness" but comprehensively build a self-perpetuating empire.

More regional government for metropolitan areas.

More realistic research on the value of open areas and the methods of controlling property development to provide them.

Better presentation of our open area proposals and greater salesmanship for public support.

Money—lots of money that is not all earmarked for everyday house-keeping chores in metropolitan government. We need a more realistic tax structure other than the real estate property tax.

Finally, we need an "ACTION" program for recreation and open areas. One that is supported by industries, business, foundations and just plain folk. We need to do for open areas what has been done for urban renewal in bringing the need right into each home. Only then can we really plan ahead for open spaces with some idea that our plans will be more than an academic exercise.

Stream Pollution

MARK D. HOLLIS, Assistant Surgeon General, Chief Engineer,
Public Health Service, Washington, D. C.

Introduction. More and more large areas of the Nation are shaping up into metropolitan and industrial complexes. Concentrations of people in a technological environment are bound to create all sorts of wastes which pollute and deteriorate the water resources and, in a similar manner, the air resources. In nature, both air and water have an unusual capacity for absorbing and purifying man-made pollution—up to a point. So long as human activity does not overtax nature, air and water resources remain essentially clean and safe. In our accelerating technology, we do overtax these resources. Corrective practices to preserve a balance acceptable to all interests are not always easy.

Across the Nation, our water resource is becoming a problem of top

priority. Available supplies are being increasingly taxed. In many areas, shortages already threaten to halt further expansion. The water problem is one of increasing demands, seasonal shortages, floods and pollution.

The average urban dweller uses 150 gallons of water per day. Thirty years ago, the average use was only 20 gallons per day. People did not have laundromats, dishwashers, hot-water systems, and air conditioners. The water that goes into production of things we eat and wear and use raises the national per capita requirement to 1,500 gallons per day. By 1975, these water demands will double—expressed on an annual basis, a million gallons per capita for a population of about 200,000,000.

The mere availability of water represents only half the picture. As water use increases, pollution increases. What we face, therefore, is a vicious cycle—more water needed, to support more activity, to produce more wastes, to pollute more water. The answer involves a variety of water conservation measures. Of these, pollution abatement is essential to permit re-use of the water as streams flow from city to city. And remember that 80 million people depend on surface streams for their drinking water.

Chart Presentation—Nation's Water Supply Is Constant; Water Pollution Cycle; Sewage Treatment Plant Construction; Waste Treatment Plant Needs; Projected Loadings on Streams.

Conclusion. In earlier years, wastes were piped to the edge of town and given only superficial treatment—often no treatment at all. Factories too were located on the edge of town. In those days the water resources were able to absorb community contaminants without undue harmful effects or at worst local nuisances.

Today, in our metropolitan and industrial complexes, the situation is vastly different. Not only is technology advancing but metropolitan population is increasing—already up 35 percent over 1940. Now a hundred million people live in U. S. metropolitan areas. And for the most part, there is no longer an edge of town. The city blends into the suburban areas, also thickly populated and industrialized; the suburbs into ex-urbia areas; and vice versa to the next city. In addition, there is the ever-increasing volume of waste. And, most troublesome of all, an increasing complexity in the character of wastes.

Modern cities, with all their diverse activities, discharge thousands of tons of contaminants to water every hour. In the chemical complex involving countless new compounds, the resulting actions and reactions, continually occurring in water, produce situations extremely difficult to measure and even more difficult to understand. The atomic age introduces an entirely new set of terms, equations, and factors. Radioactive contamination does not follow our set patterns and established formulas of dispersion, dilution and biochemical actions.

What we need most is a better understanding of behavior and ef-

fects of contaminants in water, and we must develop more economical methods of treatment. To produce this knowledge will require a much broader research effort.

Now to shift gears for a moment. The engineering and technical aspects of pollution control likely will be less difficult in the long run than the related political, economic, and legal considerations. Water pollution more and more influences the pattern of metropolitan growth and land use. The degree of regulatory control, how it is applied, and especially where it is centered, raises important and fundamental questions.

Effects of pollution are seldom limited to one political jurisdiction. Always difficult is the question of financing necessary remedial measures. Even more difficult is the question of obtaining agreement among various interests as to the best use of environmental resources. There is real need for public awareness and for public understanding.

If the pollution problems of the future are to be met and managed, coordinated city and regional planning must be the basis. This must integrate the social, political, legal, and economic factors with the technical ones. Each State needs to appraise its problems realistically and to develop a framework which will foster a partnership participation by other public and private interests. This will require a degree of effort much better organized and much better understood by the public than present-day practices.

Federal Water Policy

MELVIN E. SCHEIDT, U. S. Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D. C.

The need for a water policy. The equitable apportionment, use and control of water in the United States today presents technical, administrative and legal problems, the solution of which is paramount to our continued progress in social and economic wellbeing. This situation requires a National, rather than a Federal, water policy.

Our population has more than doubled since 1900, and is expected to reach 200 million by 1975. Water consumption has increased at a much greater rate than population, however, due in large measure to increased standards of living, the increased requirements of our rapidly expanding industries, and to the great shift in population from rural to urban areas. Then too, the use of water for irrigation, traditionally a Western practice, has grown at such a rapid rate in the Eastern States, that many of these States are reexamining their laws governing water use. Total use of water for all purposes is expected to about double by 1975.

Many of our water problems grow out of the climatic characteristics of the various regions of the country. Areas which, in one year or season are inundated by disastrous floods are, perhaps in the very next season, devastated by droughts. Some regions are restricted in their growth by an absolute limit on the amount of water available, while others, enjoying a humid climate and an apparent superabundance of water, are nevertheless restricted in new water uses because of excessive stream pollution. Still other problems arise over legal ownership of water, who is responsible for its development, or how the costs of such developments shall be divided. Serious arguments arise over competing uses for the same water, or over the methods by which desirable objectives involving water use and control can be achieved.

Some of these problems existed in the early days of the Nation. I was very much interested to find, for example, references to a controversy between navigation and industrial interests over the construction of a dam across the James River in the papers of Thomas Jefferson in the National Archives. Only within the last half-century, however, have these water problems begun to reach serious proportions, and only in the last 20 years have serious efforts been made to bring about a comprehensive approach to their solution.

Federal activities in water resources development. Before discussing these various efforts to develop a national water policy, I think it might be helpful first to outline briefly the activities of the Federal Government in water resources developments, since it plays a major role in this field. Four Federal agencies are directly concerned in a major way with the planning and construction of water resources facilities.

The Corps of Engineers has general responsibility for the construction and maintenance of navigation and flood control projects. Facilities for power, recreation, fish and wildlife and irrigation may also be included in Corps projects where appropriate, and sale to municipalities of excess storage capacity is also authorized under certain conditions. Costs of power and irrigation are required to be repaid, and local contribution toward costs of local navigation and flood control facilities is also required.

The Bureau of Reclamation constructs irrigation facilities in the 17 Western States. Reclamation projects may also include facilities for flood control, other water supply, power, and fish and wildlife development where appropriate. Costs of irrigation, power, and water supply facilities are required to be repaid.

The Department of Agriculture, under the 1936 flood control act is undertaking upstream flood prevention work on 11 authorized watershed projects. Under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954, it also provides financial and technical assistance to organized districts for the construction of water control facilities on

watersheds of less than 250,000 acres. Although other uses of water may be included in these watershed projects, only the flood control aspects of water storage facilities may be financed with Federal Funds.

The Tennessee Valley Authority has responsibility for the full development of the Tennessee River for flood control, navigation, power, and other purposes. Investments in power facilities from appropriated funds are repayable.

The activities of other Federal agencies concerned with water resources, such as the Public Health Service, National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Geological Survey, the Weather Bureau and Federal Power Commission involve research and technical assistance to non-Federal agencies with respect to water supply and waste disposal, basic data collection and publication, construction and operation of recreation, fish and wildlife and other facilities, and regulation and licensing of private hydro-electric power developments. These agencies on occasion participate with or assist the major construction agencies in the investigation of river development projects and programs. Doctor Hollis has already told you of the work of the Public Health Service with respect to pollution abatement and control.

As you already know, the fact that water resources activities are spread among such a variety of agencies induced two Commissions which were established by Congress to study the organizational problems of the Executive Branch of the Government to make recommendations for reorganization of these functions.

Single purpose and multiple purpose projects. The earlier programs of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation consisted almost entirely of single purpose projects for navigation, flood control or irrigation. These generally did not directly affect other important water uses such as municipal water supply, pollution abatement, recreation or power.

The Hoover Dam, construction of which was started in 1928 by the Bureau of Reclamation, was the first major multiple purpose reservoir development to be undertaken by the Federal Government, but the multiple purpose concept of project development, whereby all of the potentialities of a particular site or river for a variety of purposes are evaluated in the formulation of a plan of development, did not receive widespread attention until the mid-1930's. With the authorization of the Tennessee Valley program, and inauguration of construction of the Central Valley, Grand Coulee and Bonneville projects, this principle became generally accepted. Along with the multiple purpose concept, however, came differences of opinion over the purposes to be included in these developments, methods of evaluating the benefits and costs of these purposes, allocation of costs among purposes served, and questions regarding who should pay how much for them.

Comprehensive basin programs. Following the adoption of the Tennessee Valley Program, proposals were heard for the establishment of similar programs in other river basins, but fear of Federal domination prevented their adoption. In 1944, however, the Congress, following submission of separate reports by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, adopted the Pick-Sloan plan for the joint development of the entire Missouri River Basin. Public controversy regarding the desirability of this approach to river basin development led to various proposals for a Missouri Valley Authority and also for an Inter-State Compact Commission. Proposals were also made at about this time for a Columbia Basin Administration.

No significant action with respect to major river basin planning occurred, however, until 1950, when the Congress authorized the Corps of Engineers to undertake comprehensive surveys of the Arkansas-White-Red River Basin and of the New England-New York area. All affected Federal agencies were directed by the President to participate in these surveys under a committee arrangement, with the Corps of Engineers acting as chairman agency. The affected States, in each case, were invited to become members of these committees. Final reports on these surveys have not yet been submitted, but the various problems that arose in the course of undertaking the surveys, particularly in the AWR area, served to emphasize many of the difficulties encountered in any attempt to undertake comprehensive river basin planning.

Difficulties surrounding comprehensive river basin developments. One of the most troublesome of these difficulties has been that of justification of projects. Under the flood control laws, projects are justified on an economic feasibility basis; that is, the benefits, to whomsoever they may accrue, must exceed the costs of the project. Neither costs nor benefits are defined, however, and the degree of excess of benefits over costs is not stipulated. Methods of computing costs, including such things as period of amortization and interest on investment are also left unspecified.

Reclamation projects, on the other hand, are required to be justified on an engineering and financial feasibility basis. If project revenues are estimated to be sufficient to repay in forty years the costs of those aspects of the project which are required to be reimbursed, the project may, by law, be declared authorized by the Secretary of the Interior unless objections are filed by other affected parties. Excess power revenues may be used to help repay irrigation costs. If a longer period than 40 years will be required for repayment, the Secretary may submit a report on the project to Congress with recommendations for its authorization.

In recent years reclamation project reports sent to Congress have proposed repayment periods substantially longer than 50 years, in addition to a permissible 10 year payment-free development period, and

greater assistance from other sources for financing irrigation features has been required. As additional justification, therefore, economic evaluations have been included in the reports to the Congress on such projects.

Because of the difference in the basic laws under which the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation operate, these two agencies have followed different practices in computing the economic benefits used in project justifications and in allocating costs among purposes served. The length of the repayment period also varies.

Widespread differences of opinion also exist, not only between agencies, but between various segments of the public, regarding the degree of effectiveness of the upstream flood control measures of the Department of Agriculture, as compared with other types of flood control. Need for greater coordination of the several flood control programs is thus indicated.

Other difficulties relate to the basis for determining the national interest in recreation, sediment control, pollution abatement, and other purposes, some of which have been proposed in project reports as non-reimbursable Federal purposes. In some cases, Presidential vetoes of projects have been based on the fact that there is no general basic legislation establishing recreation as a Federal purpose. The Pollution Control Act of 1948, authorizes Federal loans to assist municipalities in constructing sewage treatment facilities, but no part of the cost of such facilities may be borne by the Federal Government. Legislation regarding inclusion in Federal projects of municipal water supply and recreation features differs widely between agencies.

Past efforts to coordinate programs and to develop a water policy. These and other problems affecting water use and control have brought about efforts over the past two decades to coordinate the various Federal programs, and to provide a sound basis for planning water facilities. During the late 30's and early 40's, the National Resources Planning Board and its predecessor planning agencies established a committee on water resources which not only undertook a survey of the drainage basin problems and programs of the Nation, but undertook the review and coordination of Federal water projects, including their clearance through a system of regional river basin committees.

At about this same time, the Council of State Governments was instrumental in bringing about the creation of the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River. Similar commissions were later established for the Potomac and the Ohio rivers. These commissions, composed of representatives from each affected State plus limited Federal representation, do not undertake developments themselves. They have as their objective the coordination of the programs of the constituent members, and the promotion of sound water policies within these river basins, particularly with respect to pollution control and water supply.

After the National Resources Planning Board was discontinued in

1943, the principal Federal agencies concerned with water development voluntarily created the Federal Inter-agency River Basin Committee to continue on an informal basis the clearance of their respective reports with each other and to effect some measure of coordination in their programs. Similar committees at the river basin level were also established in the Missouri, the Columbia, the Arkansas, the Southwest, and in New England.

In 1943 the Bureau of the Budget, under authority of Executive Order 9384, was delegated authority to review reports on water resources projects for the President. The experiences encountered in carrying out this task led to the creation by the President in January 1950 of a President's Water Resources Policy Commission composed of seven members selected from outside the government. This Commission was instructed to give consideration to the extent and character of Federal participation in major water resources programs, an appraisal of the priority of water resources programs from the standpoint of economic and social need, criteria and standards for evaluating the feasibility of water resources projects, and desirable legislation or changes in existing legislation relating to the development, utilization, and conservation of water resources.

The Commission submitted its final report in December 1950. It stated that development of water and related land resources should be accomplished within the frame work of comprehensive basin-wide programs which should provide for all possible uses and benefits, and that all interested governmental and other groups should have an opportunity to participate in the preparation of these programs. A system of inter-agency river basin planning commissions headed by independent chairmen and with limited state representation was recommended, and a set of uniform principles and standards for the economic evaluation of projects was proposed. Other recommendations dealt with reimbursement and cost sharing, division of responsibility and other matters considered essential for an effective national water program.

No official action was taken on this report but review of the Commission's recommendations by an inter-agency committee under the chairmanship of the Budget Bureau led to the promulgation in December 1952, of Budget Bureau Circular No. A-47. This circular sets forth standards and procedures to be used by the Executive Office of the President in reviewing proposed water resources project reports for determination of their relationship to the program of the President, as well as for reviewing budget estimates to initiate construction of such projects.

Report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy. The need for a sound, uniform water resources policy which would operate on a national basis continued to be felt in the work of the Eisenhower Administration to such an extent that the President,

in May 1954, appointed an Advisory Cabinet Committee on Water Resources Policy, with instructions to submit "recommendations for the strengthening, clarification and modernization of water policies, together with a suggested approach to the solution of organizational problems involved." The committee consisted of the Secretary of the Interior, as chairman, and the Secretaries of Defense and Agriculture as members. In addition, the Departments of Health, Education and Welfare, Commerce and Justice, and the Bureau of the Budget participated on an *ad hoc* basis. The report of this committee was submitted to the President on December 22, 1955, and was transmitted by him to the Congress on January 17, 1956. It represents the latest step in the direction of achieving a national water policy.

The report sets forth eight general conclusions which establish the basic principles upon which the recommendations of the Advisory Committee are based. These conclusions are of such importance that I think it desirable to quote the significant features of each of them. They are as follows:

1. The greatest single weakness in the Federal Government's activities in the field of water resources development is the lack of cooperation and coordination of the Federal agencies with each other and with the States and local interests.

2. There is no single uniform policy, no magic formula relating to water resources which can be applied to all parts of the country at all times and in all places.

3. It is not practicable, and certainly not desirable, for the Federal Government alone to assume responsibility for the complete development of the Nation's water resources.

4. The principle of equal contribution for equal benefits received should be applied to the beneficiaries of all Federal water resources developments, although historically programs of Federal agencies have differed widely as to contributions required from beneficiaries.

5. The principles which recognize water rights as property rights should be accepted, but a study should be made by the Federal Government in cooperation with state and local bodies to develop principles concerning water rights that would assure the most effective use of water to best meet the needs of the people—national, regional, state, and local.

6. The States should have primary responsibility for controlling water pollution at its source, but the Federal Government should assist the States through research, investigation, and technical assistance in solving pollution problems, and should participate in the planning of long-range programs for the abatement of pollution, in addition to enforcing Federal statutes applicable to the abatement of pollution in interstate waters.

7. It is generally sound to plan coordinated development of water

resources by large river-basin areas, but shifts in population and in economic and industrial growth indicate that in some instances consideration of water resources development should be viewed from the standpoint of a region rather than solely from that of a river basin.

8. Because international programs and projects cannot always be expected to conform with the same standards and procedures that are proposed for exclusively domestic programs or projects, the report should be considered as generally applicable to domestic waters only.

Based on the foregoing principles, the Committee submitted a number of recommendations. Thus, it proposed that, for river basin planning purposes, water resources committees should be established, as occasion requires, at the regional or river basin level. The membership of these committees would consist of one representative of each Federal Department having water resources responsibilities and one representative from each affected State, all on an equal basis. Each committee would be headed by a permanent, non-voting chairman, appointed by the President. The Committee states that it did not regard the total number of either Federal or state representatives as material since conflicts should be resolved by cooperation and not by voting strength.

The Committee recommended that each water resources committee prepare and keep up to date a comprehensive plan which will best serve the region and the Nation in the development of water and related land resources for all purposes. Such plans would be developed cooperatively by Federal, State and local interests, public and private, and would be divorced from any concept of authorization or responsibility to build. Rather, they would provide the basis for the selection of individual projects to be undertaken by the various individual agencies and non-Federal interests. Each committee would recommend an annual work schedule which would be reflected in the budget of each cooperating agency. The chairman of each committee would be responsible to a Coordinator of Water Resources in the Office of the President, and would have a small independent staff.

The Advisory Committee also recommended that an Inter-Agency Committee on Water Resources, composed of the heads of Federal agencies involved in water resources, and chaired by the Coordinator of Water Resources, be established in Washington to coordinate Federal water resources activities. The coordinator would establish principles, standards and procedures for the use and guidance of the Federal agencies in the planning of programs and projects. A Board of Review, reporting to the Coordinator, would be charged with the review and evaluation of projects proposed by the agencies for construction.

Next to the recommendation on river basin planning, perhaps the most important proposal of the Committee concerns evaluation of projects. The Committee recommended that project evaluations by all

agencies be prepared on a uniform basis, following common standards under the direction of the Coordinator of Water Resources. The Committee stated that because the benefit-cost ratio which is usually used to indicate the economic feasibility of a project does not reflect intangible benefits or costs, such a ratio should not be the only criterion of desirability of a particular project. It recommended that the evaluation period to be used in estimating benefits and costs be limited to 50 years, tempered in the case of irrigation projects, by an additional 10-year payment-free period for development to take place.

The Committee also recommended that investigation of major projects be undertaken only when approved by Congress, and that major Federal projects be authorized only by specific act of Congress.

On the subject of participation in costs, the Committee stated that it was unable to discover for all cases a completely equitable, yet practicable, procedure for cost sharing, based solely on the principle of sharing costs in proportion to benefits. It proposed, however, that, as a general policy, the Federal Government should not build any project or part thereof that can, under fair and reasonable terms be built by non-Federal interests, except those projects of primary national concern, where non-Federal interests are unable adequately to meet the need. Otherwise identifiable beneficiaries of Federal projects should pay an appropriate share of costs in all instances. Beneficiaries of power, municipal, and industrial water supply should pay 100 percent of costs allocated to these purposes. The use of excess revenues from power and other purposes to help meet irrigation costs is endorsed, provided such revenues are applied in the area in which they are derived. Responsibility for maintenance, operation and management of projects should be turned over to non-Federal interests as soon as feasible in consideration of the Federal investment.

There are a number of other recommendations which I believe are worthy of your attention but there is not time to discuss them here. Of greatest significance to this meeting, I believe, are those proposals involving procedures and organizational arrangements for river basin planning and for sharing in the responsibility and the costs of water developments.

The Committee's proposals are admittedly not the only solution to water resources problems, nor do they deal with all the problems involved. In fact, the Committee, in transmitting the report to the President, indicated that, while its recommendations were intended to be constructive, they would not immediately be acceptable to all persons and organizations concerned with water resources. The Committee expressed the belief, however, that their recommendations give proper recognition to the responsibilities of all levels of Government and are in the best interests of the Nation.

Planning Assistance to Flood-Damaged Communities in Connecticut

FREDERICK P. CLARK, Planning Consultant, Rye, N. Y.

WHEN the floods of August, 1955 hit several of the river valleys of Connecticut, it was not a new experience for many people, businesses and industries in those valleys. Periodically in the past, floods had visited these valleys. However, the severity of the August floods far exceeded past experience and dramatized the necessity of doing something about the problem. And just when people were beginning to discount the August disaster by saying it couldn't happen again, major floods struck a second time, just two months later.

In the two floods, 91 persons lost their lives, more than 1,100 families were made homeless, another 2,300 families were temporarily without shelter, and nearly 20,000 households suffered flood damage. About 86,000 persons were thrown out of work, and business and industry suffered tremendous losses. The first concern of all was for the safety of those affected by the disasters, emergency housing for the homeless, and the reestablishment of communications and services.

But when the disastrous floods hit Connecticut, Governor Ribicoff saw beyond the immediate and serious emergency. He saw the opportunity to rebuild better and stronger communities and he immediately provided leadership to this effort. At almost every meeting with local citizens and officials throughout the flood-damaged areas, he called attention to and emphasized the importance of town planning. In his message to the special session of the General Assembly, which had met to deal with reconstruction problems, he said "One of the greatest opportunities this Legislature has to leave its imprint on the future of Connecticut is in the field of town planning. Here you can take the leadership in seeing that from the wreckage of the floods will rise a greater and finer and more modern state."

Immediately following the floods, while crews were just moving in to clean up the wreckage, he established an Advisory Committee on Planning Assistance and inaugurated a program of state assistance to towns and cities in planning for necessary and desirable rebuilding. This program was, and still is, administered by the State Development Commission, specifically the Division of Research and Planning.

The Governor, in order to avoid any delay in getting started, made \$75,000 available from the Governor's Contingency Fund to employ experienced town planners. This assistance was made available to flood-damaged communities who requested such help. A total of eighteen, all the more seriously affected communities, have so far taken advantage of this planning assistance program.

At all times it has been emphasized that this is a voluntary program.

Technical planning assistance is made available to a community only upon its official request, and whether any of such planning advice is followed is entirely a local decision. The State, under the Governor's leadership, is making sure that communities have the opportunity to find out how they can rebuild better. The assistance is being made available at no cost to the communities. This has been important since the flood destruction has lessened the financial resources of these places at a time when they must spend additional funds to rebuild.

The special session of the General Assembly acted to provide additional planning funds to carry on the program started with the emergency funds and these funds are being supplemented by Federal funds under its planning assistance program. In addition, the General Assembly authorized State financial aid to supplement the Federal aid on urban redevelopment and renewal projects. Almost two million dollars was appropriated for this purpose, limited to redevelopment projects in flood-damaged communities.

The Governor's Advisory Committee on Planning Assistance worked with the State Development Commission in quickly organizing a practical program of local planning assistance, and in recommending new or revised planning laws needed by the communities in doing a good job of replanning and rebuilding. Much of this program was enacted by the special legislative session.

A most important feature of the State's program is a series of regional planning studies to be undertaken in the principal river valleys affected by the floods. This will be done concurrently with the local planning efforts. Obviously, the problem of replanning river valley communities must take into account the planning of the valley as a whole. Flood-control planning, highway and transportation planning, and planning for future economic development must be approached on a regional level. This is being done. Regional planning studies are underway or authorized in the Naugatuck, Farmington and Quinebaug River Valleys.

Homes, businesses and industries in any river valley must live with that river. Development of land along the river usually involves a compromise between the needs of the river for flowage space and the needs of man for land to develop for his purposes. Where man takes too much, the river periodically reclaims it. One school of thought feels that development should be limited slightly, if at all, and that flood waters should be retained upstream by means of dams, and downstream by means of dikes. An opposite school of thought feels that the lowlands belong to the river and that man should keep his developments on higher land.

However, we do know that after many years of floods, flood-control surveys, and plans for flood control works, comparatively little has been accomplished. There are some who indicate that the cost of flood

control works, adequate to prevent serious floods, would be prohibitive and that it would be much cheaper and better to purchase the property in the flood plains downstream. Whatever the truth of such predictions, it would seem to be wise that low-lying areas, subject to flooding should not be developed until the flood-control facilities necessary to prevent such flooding are in existence or under construction. A paper plan for a flood-control dam will not prevent floods, damage or loss of life.

Much of the land along our streams should never have been encroached on with intensive development. However, the relative ease of constructing travel routes (highways and railroads) along the bottoms of river valleys made it inevitable that development would occur there. And it is likely we will never change that. It will be necessary, however, if these river valleys are to grow and prosper, that expansion of residential, business and industrial development be possible without encroaching upon flood plains. In making our plans for river valley communities, we will have to have the full cooperation of flood control experts to tell us what flood control is possible and economically feasible.

It is inevitable that business and industry affected by the floods will give serious thought to the wisdom of any further expansion in such areas. The economic welfare of the valley depends upon the investment in production facilities and upon the vitality of the productive activities. New plants and equipment facilities will be needed to replace obsolete facilities.

Necessary planning for these flood-affected valleys will involve making them attractive for investment. If an area is one in which industry wishes to invest in new facilities, in which people desire to invest in new homes, in which business finds it profitable to invest in new and expanded facilities to serve the people of the valley then, that valley will be happy and prosperous.

Many of the communities along these rivers were old and some had lost much of their attractiveness. Most places affected had development problems of one kind or another—traffic congestion, lack of parking, areas of run-down housing, lack of recreation areas, lack of adequate sites for business and industrial growth, and the like. Some of these needs—parking and recreation, for example—may be ideal uses for flood-plain areas. The destructive force of the floods partly cleared some areas of blighted housing. In other places, the floods cleared a location for a needed street widening or connection. These are but a few of the opportunities opened up by the floods.

All of this is a great challenge to the town planners. But it is an even greater challenge to these communities which must rebuild. Will they take full advantage of the opportunities to lessen their dangers, to improve their business and housing areas, and to become better communities from it all? It is far more difficult to make changes in and rebuild an old community than it is to guide new town development. In

some ways, the flood destruction opened up practicable opportunities that otherwise might not have become possible for years. Strong teamwork on the part of town governments, property owners, and the State will be needed to capitalize on these opportunities. What is particularly helpful and new here, is the leadership on the part of the State in providing funds and technical assistance and, especially, in dramatizing the chance to better the towns and, in turn, the State.

DISCUSSION

JEAN R. PACKARD, Director of Information,
National Parks Association, Washington, D. C.

THE discussion period was opened by Mr. Malcolm Crooks, who commented that 50 percent of the flood damage occurs on small streams. He suggested that flood control measures begin here by setting aside flood plain areas on these upriver streams as recreational facilities, prohibiting farming and industrial expansion here.

Following Mr. Clark's talk on the zoning of flood plains and the rebuilding of damaged industrial sites on higher ground, Mr. Graham asked if preliminary studies showed whether or not the topography of surrounding elevations was suitable for industrial building or if considerable regrading would be necessary. Mr. Clark said that usually the main consideration in such relocation was the lack of accessibility, since the majority of the existing roads are in or close to the flood plains, and would have to be rebuilt on higher ground.

Mr. Carl Feiss questioned whether payment from the flood insurance bills presently before Congress could be predicated on the re-planning of destroyed areas. He mentioned that certain slums in Kansas City, for example, had been washed away by floods, and the Red Cross money for rehabilitation had to be used to rebuild the area in its former condition. Mr. Scheidt said such steps were being considered, but he did not know how much progress had been made to date. Mr. Herbert Hare, of Kansas City, added that the residents of the slums Mr. Feiss had mentioned preferred their homes as they had been before, and were not particularly impressed with garden apartments and other improvements.

Mr. Fred Packard asked why funds allotted by the Pollution Act of 1948 had not been appropriated for use. Dr. Hollis commented that the Public Health Service had been unable to convince the Bureau of the Budget of the necessity for these funds. He added that the bill had been drawn up with so many limitations that the end results reached by the expenditure of these ear-marked funds would have meant only minor corrective effects. When further questioned as to whether future attempts will be made to gain these appropriations, Dr. Hollis said two groups—

financial, and state and municipal—had been set up to establish a need for Federal financial aid. Results showed there seemed to be ample money available from private sources if the cities wished to continue their anti-pollution programs.

One of the problems, he continued, was the specialization that has separated water treatment from sewage treatment. He said these should be combined, at least financially and administratively. Often the interest rates on financing sewage treatment plants are much higher than for water treatment works because of the uncertainty of being able to finance the former.

Dr. Hollis was also asked if any research is underway to discover the true carrying capacity of soils in urban areas to treat waste products. He stated that a two-year research program on soil absorption is now in the final stages, and a report on the findings should be available through the Public Health Service within 30 days.

Mr. Packard asked about the potentialities of converting sea water to usable fresh water and the problem of piping it where needed. Dr. Hollis said this process is nearing practical reality; it is being done now but not efficiently enough. According to our present rate of acceleration in water use since 1940, this country will be out of water within 15 years unless drastic measures are taken, he said, but the next 10 years should see the commercial use of sea water.

Mr. Crooks stated that there is more water in the northeastern section of this country than anywhere else, since these States receive up to 45 inches of rainfall annually. Despite this they still suffer from droughts and water shortages, and all forms of water conservation are badly needed.

Mr. Chute closed the discussion by stating that water problems are becoming more complex each year. With the constantly growing population and industrialization in the eastern section of the country, one State there has gone into the water business, transporting water from one major populated area to another. Such activities as these are usually handled by the municipalities, but the demand is rapidly becoming too large for them to handle.

Panel on Highways and Community Life

CARL FEISS, Planning and Urban Renewal Consultant,
Washington, D. C.

THE time has come to clearly relate all Federal aid programs for highway construction to local comprehensive community plans and programs, whether of the State, the county, the metropolitan area or the municipal area. This means no local plans, no cash. While there is no question that highway planning standards are improving, there is

great confusion in the minds of most highway engineers between highway planning and community planning. They think they are the same thing. They are not. The standards of the two have got to be brought together to form the basis for sound community development and growth. People and the community are still more important than the automobile, the truck, or the highway. There is need for a continuing education program with highway engineers; and such an education program needs to begin in the schools where the highway engineer receives his basic training.

The appalling death toll on the highways is matched with the appalling death toll by automobile in our neighborhoods, themselves. We are no longer safe anywhere. The pioneer work done by Clarence Stein and others attempting to design communities that separate highway and pedestrian traffic has not been adequately recognized by either the highway planners or the automotive industry. There is grave doubt in my mind that any major opportunity is going to be provided to the community planners to protect the citizens from themselves and each other unless the automotive industry, including all of its affiliates, in particular the fuel, rubber and electrical industries, concern themselves with the problems which they have created and the destruction of the value of communities which has been one of the results of the first half century of the motor age. God alone can guess what the next half century will bring.

It should be clear by this time that for all the benefits of the motor age an assessment of assets and liabilities must be made. Real research into the solution of our problems has just begun and cannot keep pace with what is happening. Autopia is still a long way off.

This conference should urge that federal public roads officials stimulate local general planning and neighborhood planning; that highway conferences conducted by the Highway Research Council, the National Safety Council, the Automobile Association of America and other citizens' and technical highway groups, concentrate on the fundamental issues involved in the design of cities for the motor age. It should be clear by now that the problem is not merely one of congestion and adequate parking. It is not merely one of intercommunication, but rather it is one affecting directly the welfare of people and the standards of property.

EDMUND N. BACON, Executive Director,
City Planning Commission, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

MR. BACON, speaking extemporaneously, remarked that, "The most important thing about highways is mass transit. The right balance between automobile traveling and public transit riding has to be determined and achieved, if communities are to make the most effective

use of present streets and expensive road facilities that are yet to be built."

Mr. Bacon quoted the conclusion expressed in the preliminary report of the Philadelphia Urban Traffic and Transportation Board which was released in December 1955:

"Transportation services," the Board's report reads, "in the Philadelphia metropolitan area should be maintained on a self-supporting basis.

"The cities, counties, townships and boroughs of the Area are in desperate need of operating and capital funds. General governmental purposes, housing, and redevelopment will require substantially all of the foreseeable funds available to local governments. Transportation must, therefore, be financed on a self-supporting basis.

"Self-support may not be possible for each separate segment of the transportation system, but is possible for the system as a whole.

"Public transit is essential to alleviating highway congestion.

"To the extent that people can be attracted to public transit riding, particularly in peak hours, public expenditures for highway construction and maintenance are reduced.

"If the public desires to avoid the greater highway outlays which would be required to accommodate those now riding on rails, it will have to assume in some way a part of the cost involved.

"Mutual support from the financial resources of the various forms of transportation service should be considered as a means of aiding transport modernization. In this way, credit could be made available on favorable terms, and needed financing provided for railroad, transit, highway, and parking facilities.

"Such mutual support would be possible in a unified transportation system administered by an agency that is regional in dimension. Even before that regional organization can be established, some approaches to mutual support can be made.

"The City government should try to accomplish, within its own powers, as many as possible of the objectives of regional organization during an interim period before that organization can be established."

Mr. Bacon concluded his remarks by pointing out that one means for holding down congestion on newly constructed road facilities to the capacity for which the improvement was designed is to charge a toll which will preserve optimum conditions for traffic movement.

DR. DAVID R. LEVIN, Chief, Land Studies Section,
Financial and Administrative Research Branch,
Bureau of Public Roads, Washington, D. C.

THE Federal government already contributes substantially toward highway development in urban areas, largely through the Bureau of Public Roads. Dollar-wise, the most substantial contributions concern the improvement of urban portions of the National System of Interstate Highways, extensions of the Federal-aid primary system, and urban portions of the Federal-aid secondary system.

The Bureau also facilitates an extensive program of urban highway planning and research, through the provision of funds and technical assistance. This includes such programs as map making, the assembly and analysis of all kinds of data relating to finance, mileages, traffic, laws, origin and destination surveys, parking studies in central business districts, comprehensive metropolitan transportation investigations such as those in Detroit and Chicago, special urban highway studies such as the urban traffic and land use study by Mitchell and Rapkin, and all kinds of other special studies undertaken with administrative funds on urban highway traffic, economics of highway development, administration, laws, terminal facilities, and others too numerous to mention. All of these are exclusively concerned with the urban highway problem. These are financed either with the so-called 1½ percent funds or with administrative funds.

Another class of studies concerns State-wide programs, a portion of which deals with urban segments. These involve financial and technical assistance on longer-range programs of highway needs; fiscal requirements; revision of highway laws; physical, design, and traffic research of all kinds; and studies relating to the legal, economic, and administrative aspects of highway betterment.

The Bureau and its technicians are also associated with other organizations that are earnestly trying to improve urban highway transportation, many of them in a larger context. These would include the Highway Research Board, National Committee on Urban Transportation, National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances, National Joint Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, National Safety Council, Institute of Traffic Engineers, Municipal Law Section of American Bar Association, American Automobile Association, American Association of State Highway Officials, Automotive Safety Foundation, and other organizations. It also makes available technical publications of all kinds, participates in technical meetings of municipal groups, and otherwise contributes to urban highway improvement.

Other agencies of the Federal government also are concerned with urban highway problems, directly or indirectly. Illustrative is the Housing and Home Finance Agency which administers the Urban redevelopment and renewal programs. Bearing on the transportation

problem are such matters as the master plan requirement, the integration of highways and urban redevelopment plans, provision for rights-of-way for arterial highway projects, provision of terminal facilities, and technical assistance of all kinds. The Executive Office of the President has recently set up an office concerned with the integration of Federal, State and local public works planning. There are airport and highway programs, civilian defense, and other Federal activities that touch the urban highway problem in some way.

MRS. CYRIL G. FOX, Member, Executive Committee,
Pennsylvania Roadside Council, Inc., Media, Pennsylvania

IT WOULD be difficult to imagine a more glaring refutation of the hackneyed statement, "Where Ignorance Is Bliss 'Tis Folly To Be Wise," than in our modern highway building program. By this I do not mean to imply that our highway builders shall be accused of ignorance, or of failing to keep abreast of new and improved techniques in construction. Far from it! They have done amazingly well, considering the vagaries of the political system under which they must work. Witness the steady growth of limited-access highway construction in practically every state, the magnificent parkways already gracing many Eastern states, and the ever-increasing number of toll roads. No, the charge of "ignorance" must be laid at the door of highway users, together with the even more inexcusable APATHY.

Thru the years the pleas of highway planners, civic groups, and public spirited individuals for zoning protection for these fine new highways, to prevent the commercial exploitation which had so quickly reduced the efficiency of older ones, have been disregarded by State Legislatures. The blandishments of high-paid lobbyists for special interests seeking to use the public's highway investment for private gain have, to date, proved more alluring. And the general public, apparently blind to the senseless waste of its precious highway dollars, has failed to recognize the urgency for proper legislative controls for its highway corridors, even as it clamors for relief from their dangerous inadequacy.

Fortunately, important women's organizations such as the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Garden Club of America, and the National Council of State Garden Clubs, together with the various State Roadside Councils, the American Automobile Association, and similar groups which have long been concerned with the problem, are now simultaneously urging remedial action at the national level. They insist that selfish pressure groups, such as those responsible for the notable failure of last year's proposed highway improvement program, must not be permitted to jeopardize the future of new highways. They are calling upon the Bureau of Public Roads to impress upon the States that Federal Aid for new highways implies the obligation to protect their

efficiency. And furthermore, they urge that public officials in charge of implementing the proposed new inter-state highway program take full cognizance of the urgency for protective highway zoning legislation, and follow the recommendations of the American Society of Landscape Architects for the designing and maintenance of such new highways.

HAROLD TAUBIN, Planning Engineer,
Montgomery Co., Md.

"The United States," said Wilfred Owen, the Brookings Institution's Senior Staff Economist and Chairman of the Workshop on "Highways and Community Life," "is a nation suffering from a combination of urbanization and motorization. The automobile has supplied the average family with a means of escape from the congestion of our 19th century cities; as well as the means of transporting the city slums to the suburbs. We have the ludicrous instance of industries, which depend upon traffic movement for their livelihood, being the first to encroach upon highways and the surrounding countryside. There is a pressing need for the highway builder and community planner to work in harmony with each other. This need is made all the more urgent by the impact which the Federal road improvement program has upon continued development. An accelerated national highway construction program, such as is presently contemplated, should lead to better transportation and community planning; it should be capable of producing plans and developments that will free our urban communities of the congested living and traffic patterns that have become associated with them; it should not add to the problems of urban life; it should be capable of fostering the community's well being through sound comprehensive planning."

The panelists elaborated on the theme outlined in Mr. Owen's opening remarks and provided the more than 100 assembled persons with a thought provoking session. The discussion period is summarized following the papers of the panelists. At the conclusion of the session, the following resolution was unanimously adopted as representing the sentiments of all participants (panelists and audience) at the workshop: "The American Planning and Civic Association, at its workshop on 'Highways and Community Life' on Wednesday, February 8, 1956, resolved that

"In the accelerated highway program under consideration by the Congress, provision be made that no funds should be granted to urban areas unless highway construction projects have been related to overall community plans."

Roland B. Greeley, Professor of Planning at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, remarked on the complacency with which "limited access" highways have been accepted in this country. He pointed to the need for protecting other roads that are not "limited access" in design.

Russell Van Nest Black said that, when it comes to roadside protection, the local areas have let down on the job. He called for State requirements that will impose effective zoning controls for the protection of highways and their rights of way.

Carl Feiss said that he didn't agree with the recommendation offered by Mr. Black, because he felt that this was only a means of passing the buck. Mr. Feiss said that the greatest need within each State, with regard to the protection of roadside rights of way, was for each State to provide a means for producing interrelated series of construction and financing plans.

Mr. Frederick Bigger, Chairman of the Pittsburgh City Planning Commission, stated that he was concerned with the multiplicity of jurisdictions that have to be considered for the establishment and protection of an efficient highway system. He said that he would like to see a greater centralization of responsibility.

Mr. Charles W. Eliot, Professor of Planning at Harvard University, brought the workshop's attention to the tourist route program in Massachusetts. He said that different types of highway transportation (tourist, home-to-work, truck, etc.) require different kinds of highway planning and construction to meet their needs. All of which, he said, underline the need for a comprehensive approach to the problem through Federal, State, and local comprehensive community planning programs.

Mr. Frank F. Malley, Director of the Providence City Planning Commission, said that at the present time there is a lack of co-ordination between the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Bureau of Public Roads and their mutually overlapping programs. He said that the highway construction program had to be related to the planning program for local land uses. He said that the Federal government has to keep in mind the thoughts and requirements of the local community. He said that the Federal law which will create a long-term highway construction program should require local community plans as a basis for the expenditure of Federal money in each community.

Mrs. Cyril G. Fox reminded the audience that standards for roadside protection have already been adopted by the American Society of Landscape Architects. She said that the problem of roadside deterioration has already become so serious in the United States that it is time for someone on the very highest level of government to get tough. She called for the official adoption of A.S.L.A. standards for roadside protection by Congress.

Mr. Myron Downs, of Cincinnati, said that there was a great need for public education on the subject of roadside protection. The predominate vote still comes from the rural areas in each state, he said. An educational program can be most effectively carried out through such rural organizations as the 4-H Clubs and the Future Farmers of America. He cautioned on the need for patience; and called attention

to Mr. Alvin Cawley's book (published in 1923) which established the relationship between the automobile industry and sound city planning. Mr. Downs said that the complete silence in the auto industry since that time as regards its relationship to orderly community development appears to indicate the need for educating at least another generation of automobile drivers, home owners, and business men before any results can be expected.

Mr. Douglas Haskell, Editor of *Architectural Forum*, said that since the automobile industry has virtually imposed a development pattern on the entire country, it might be a good idea to invite the leaders of that industry to participate in discussions concerned with community development. He pointed to the Detroit experience, where planners have made contact with the auto industry. He said that the automobile industry has become increasingly aware, within the past few years, of the difficult problem it has saddled the country with and that, for this reason, it is eager to learn and work for necessary solutions.

Mr. Malcolm Dill, Director of the Baltimore County Department of Planning in Maryland, said there was a need for analyzing the criteria for locating filling stations. He voiced concern about the indiscriminate proliferation of filling stations across the urban and rural landscape. There seems to be no relation, he commented, between the actual economic need for such stations and their location.

Mrs. Fox spoke of the New Jersey attempt at dealing with the filling station problem by building a circle adjoining a major highway where all filling stations can be located, and the highway user can pick the service station he wishes to patronize.

Mr. E. L. Raymond of Cleveland, Ohio, asked whether the new Ohio toll road was being boycotted by truckers. Mr. Nicholas P. Andreeff replied that the truck operators were not boycotting the Ohio toll road; but that they had found it cheaper to use the existing free highway system. Mr. Andreeff said that the construction cost of the Ohio toll road had been predicated on the amount of anticipated toll receipts, and that the toll (in turn) had been established on the basis of anticipated traffic volume.

Mrs. Fox said that State and local jurisdictions have shown themselves to be incapable of controlling and planning for the orderly development of America's roadsides. She said that the past 15 years of effort to get the Pennsylvania State Legislature to establish reasonable and necessary roadside controls has, so far, been to no avail. She said that nowhere in the United States has an individual State established necessary state highway zoning, and took a dim view of local attempts at protecting highway rights of way. Mrs. Fox summed up her impressions regarding the ability and readiness of State and local areas to establish necessary roadside controls by stating that the time had come for the Bureau of Public Roads to provide that either the State and local areas

protect the roads for which they have received (and will in the future receive) Federal money for construction and improvement, or no further Federal assistance will be forthcoming.

Mr. Owen, the Chairman of the workshop, summed up the sense of the meeting as follows:

1. It is essential that automobile manufacturers and highway officials get together with community planners for the purpose of developing the highway system which the United States requires; and to insure the protection of that highway system.
2. That the planning conferences and highway conferences which are held annually and are presently isolated from each other, be brought together for the purpose of realizing their common objectives.
3. That any Federal legislation regarding a long-term road improvement program include, or be administered in such a manner as to insure, requiring a comprehensive community planning program as a prerequisite to the provision of Federal road funds.
4. That minimum roadside protection and design standards be established by the U. S. Bureau of Public Roads; and that all State and local jurisdictions be required to abide by such standards.

STATE PARKS PROGRAM

PAPERS PRESENTED AT THE 36TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON STATE PARKS, HELD AT THE GRAND TETON NATIONAL PARK, WYOMING, SEPTEMBER 7-11, 1956.

Story of Grand Teton National Park

CONRAD L. WIRTH, Director of the National Park Service, Washington, D. C.

AS WE meet in this magnificent valley, I would like to share with you a brief summary of the story of Grand Teton National Park and how its growth and development points the way, I believe, in the entire park and recreation field.

The Teton Mountain Range is one of the most outstanding mountain spectacles to be found in the Nation. The fault block that forms this range was uplifted ages ago and given a westward slant. Its eastern face presents a steep slope which has been sculptured by such natural agencies as frost, streams, snow, ice and glaciers to form the scenic features we see before us. The valley of Jackson Hole is the downthrust portion of the block fault, in which are found many of the glacial features remaining to tell the story of the important geological changes of the past.

After the probable discovery of Jackson Hole by John Colter in 1807, eight exploring or trapping expeditions passed through the area from 1811 to 1829. It received its earliest fame through being the approximate center of a circle 200 miles in diameter containing the headwaters of several major rivers where the trapping competition of two major fur companies reached an extremely high pitch. The Hole thus became one of the trapper's favorite haunts and a practical base of operations.

Succeeding years brought other parties into the area for various reasons. Jim Bridger, an ex-trapper, guided an army expedition in 1860; the Hayden survey party came in 1872 with William H. Jackson as photographer and Nathaniel P. Langford and James Stephenson who claimed to have been the first to ascend the Grand Teton. The first settlers came in 1884.

Wildlife has long been a major feature of the Grand Teton and Jackson Hole country. In fact, the earliest stated purposes in efforts to set the area aside as a public reservation before the turn of the century were "to prevent the extinction of the herds of large game roaming therein" and to conserve the scenery. One of the world's largest elk herds spends a portion of each year in and near the park. The area is also the natural habitat of moose, deer, bighorn sheep, grizzly bear, waterfowl, including the trumpeter swan, and many other forms of animal life.

The movement to set aside the Jackson Hole-Grand Teton Range area, which started shortly after the establishment of Yellowstone Park in 1872, first began to take form in 1891 when the President established Yellowstone Park Timberland Reserve comprising over a million acres. Next, the Teton Forest Reserve was established followed by a proposal in 1898 to extend the boundaries of Yellowstone National Park to the south to include the spectacular Teton country. Interest continued in the intervening years and in 1923, Jackson Hole citizens invited Superintendent Horace Albright of Yellowstone National Park to confer with them at Menor's Ferry and proposed there that the federally-owned lands of the Teton Range and in the valley be added to Yellowstone. The original Grand Teton National Park, comprising only a portion of the mountain range, was established by Act of Congress in 1929.

Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and his family visited Jackson Hole in 1926 and became interested in the plan to preserve part of it in its natural condition. Their generous and far-sighted decision to purchase private lands and donate them to the public later culminated in the Jackson Hole National Monument and, still later, in an enlarged Grand Teton National Park, including within its boundaries over 200,000 acres of former monument land of which 173,000 acres were Federal lands and 34,000 acres were given by Mr. Rockefeller and his family.

In adding a large portion of Jackson Hole to the park in 1950, Congress made provision for payments to Teton County out of park revenues to compensate for tax losses on lands acquired for park purposes during the transitional period while monetary returns from recreation values are being developed; it provided for the continuance, over a limited period, of leases issued by the Government for residential or grazing purposes; and specified procedures for the management of the elk herd.

There had been relatively little development in this park up to the end of the Korean conflict, and hence there was a distinct shortage of facilities and public accommodations. In 1953, Mr. Rockefeller announced a decision to spend \$5,500,000 on accommodations, including a lodge for 1,000 persons, as well as a cabin area at Colter Bay to accommodate (with the campground) 4,000 more.

This lodge is another phase of the fulfillment of Mr. Rockefeller's vision to assist the Nation in preserving the beauty of the Jackson Hole area and making it possible for visitors to stay in and enjoy the region. He made the decision to build the lodge even though he did not expect to gain monetary return from it; he, in conjunction with Park Service officials, picked the location for it on one of the best points of observation, Lunch Tree Hill.

The lodge was built in a contemporary design with the goal of being economical in construction, unobtrusive in appearance, and yet struct-

urally able to withstand the heavy winter snowfall. The effectiveness of this new unit in meeting visitor's needs was shown in its first season, when, in a three-month period, the lodge accommodated 62,000 guests, served an average of 2,342 meals daily, and had a 94.9 percentage of occupancy.

The Park Service, of course, has worked closely with Mr. Rockefeller, and his son Laurance, Jackson Hole Preserve, Incorporated, and the Grand Teton Lodge Company, in providing the roads and utilities for these developments and the trailer camp and campground at Colter Bay. In all, the Service has programmed more than \$4,000,000 during the past two years and is programming another \$1,500,000 this year to complete its share of the work.

The Colter Bay area has been serving the public to a considerable extent this season and will be fully completed by next season with the new trailer camp, 80 cabins, and the campground with sites for 250 families. The Colter Bay and Lodge installations are concentrated in the two portions of the park selected for public convenience and park protection. When these and other program projects as contemplated in MISSION 66 are completed, it is felt that the development here will be the most completely rounded of any of the parks.

Thus, we see the culmination, after nearly three quarters of a century, of a great conservation undertaking, worked out over the years through a combination of devoted private and public interest and action for the public benefit. Park developments are so blended into the natural scene that from any vantage point from which you see the valley and mountains as a whole, the scene is practically the same as it was in the days of the fur trade.

The conservation objective is to manage the park in such manner that all major elements of the valley and mountain scene will remain in their natural state or be restored to their natural state, insofar as that is possible, with unobtrusive facilities for human use and enjoyment of the area. The planning for these relatively few public use facilities has been based on long and painstaking analysis of the intangible but real values the park has to offer.

I am immensely proud of the achievements in this park—not because I have had a part in them but because I believe that they exhibit some of the best in human vision, personal restraint, and cooperative action as the park has taken shape. This is the very essence of park conservation work.

In this account, I do not overlook the efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation which is cooperating to fit the water control features and activities into the park scene with as little disturbance as possible and, of even greater significance, to manage the Palisades and other reservoirs downstream in such manner as to make possible a minimum draw down of Jackson Lake during the summer season. As some of you may

not know, Jackson Lake Reservoir is an enlargement of the original Jackson Lake, brought about through the building of the dam in 1902.

In the solution of this Park's problems, I am also keenly aware, and appreciative, of the cooperation of the United States Forest Service in many practical matters, including the provision of elk winter range; of the cooperative efforts of the Wyoming State authorities in the management of the elk herd, in programming access roads, and in other matters. I am not forgetting the pioneering conservation work of the Izaak Walton League of America in acquiring elk winter feed grounds in Jackson Hole and the cooperation of the Fish and Wildlife Service in the management of the elk refuge.

I am mindful and appreciative also of the long standing help, both practical and philosophical, that has been given by Dr. Olaus Murie, as President of the Wilderness Society, and by many others, both residents in the valley and elsewhere.

Time would not permit my naming all of those who have worked unselfishly to make this Park as we see it today. I have mentioned only a few to indicate how the Park has come into being. I have done so not because these individuals and agencies require thanks but as an indication of what I believe to be the most effective method of establishing parks, working out their problems, and providing the kind of recreation areas and opportunities that the people of this Country ought to have.

The eight States of the Rocky Mountain Region, the Colorado River Basin and the Great Basin—Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, Arizona and New Mexico—contain many of the finest vacation lands in the Country and present many of the best opportunities to develop State park systems that will really serve the people of these States, as well as your visitors from distant points. Every one of these eight States possesses a great variety of scenic attractions, native wildlife, mountains, canyons, and other features of interest, as well as vital, picturesque, and inspiring pioneer histories. The designation and management of many of these State attractions as State parks would not only enrich the lives of the States' residents and their visitors, but would increase the number of dollars spent by tourists in this general region.

Records and studies of the American Automobile Association indicate that probably more than \$1 billion is spent by visitors to these eight States every year. Five of the eight States rank travel as among their three biggest industries. New Mexico ranks it first.

This eight-State vacation region, containing nearly one third of the land area of the continental United States, has both room and potentialities for growth and development. While it has about one thirtieth of the population of the United States, in the State park field it has less than one one-hundredth of the Nation's State park acreage and it

spends annually less than one four-hundredth of the Nation's expenditures for State parks. In other words less than one dollar out of every \$3,000 of taxes collected by these eight States is spent on their State parks.

These statements of fact are made not to create discomfort or to point an accusing finger at any one section of our Country. They are made because I am sure that every person here is interested in them or he would not have taken the trouble to come here. They are facts not for invidious comparison but facts to recognize and on which to build.

These are among the so-called public land States. Some 56.3 percent of their total area is Federal land. The Federal holdings range all the way from 84 percent of Nevada's area to 37 percent of Montana's.

From the State park conservation point of view, these Federal holdings present both advantages and disadvantages. One segment of human nature will say, "the Federal Government has more than half of the land in these eight Western States; let the Federal Government provide our recreation facilities." Another segment of human nature—and this is the segment represented here at this Conference—will recognize that the Federal Government has not, cannot, and will not create, preserve and manage the States' recreation areas and historic shrines as the States can and should do that for themselves. State parks—the show windows of the State, as Colonel Lieber called them—can become the crowning achievement of public vision and intelligent self-government only by the vigorous and enlightened support of the States themselves. Each State can have an adequate State park system, enriching the lives of its citizens, inviting to its neighbors and the tourists from more distant points, only if the people and the government of each State want that park system and work for it.

If the public land States want to create strong systems of State parks many of the Federal agencies have both the means and the policies to assist the States and cooperate with them in this work. I refer, for instance, to the 1954 amendment of the so-called Recreation Act under which public domain lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management may be purchased and leased by States and communities for park and recreation purposes; to the policy of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers to lease Federal lands for State and local recreation-area purposes and to similar policies of other Federal land management agencies.

You will recall that a few years ago the Federal Inter-Agency Committee on Recreation—composed of numerous Federal land and water management and public service agencies concerned with recreation—recommended a general policy for the Federal Government relative to public recreation. That policy recognized that more recreation facilities and services are needed today than ever before; that opportunities for such forms of outdoor recreation as the enjoyment of scenery and

the great places of history, camping, picnicking, water and winter sports, hiking, mountain climbing, wilderness travel, hunting and fishing, are becoming more and more limited as our population grows. The policy also recognized the responsibility of communities in providing recreation areas, facilities and services to the people within their political boundaries; the responsibility of State governments in assisting the communities and by enacting adequate enabling laws, by providing advisory and information services and by providing such complementary recreation areas, facilities and services throughout the States as may be needed. The policy recognized that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to develop, and to *arrange for others to develop*, the recreation resources on the Federally-owned lands. The policy specifically stated that the Federal Government should:

"Permit and encourage the States, their political subdivisions and others, to construct and operate recreation facilities and programs on Federal Government land when it is in the public interest to do so, taking into account the long-range recreation plans of the States.

"Work with the States and territories on request, and with their political subdivisions with the consent of the States, in planning sound, long-range programs and services for State and local areas.

"Develop and maintain in cooperation with State and local governmental agencies and private interests a national recreation plan which will serve as a guide to public and private agencies in integrating their activities into the over-all recreation needs of the Country."

A further indication of the trend of developing national policy is the recommendation of the President's Water Policy Commission that the Federal Government should share in the cost of lands and recreational facilities, at Federal water control projects, for State and local use. While this broad policy has not been considered by the Congress, the Congress in specific reservoir authorizations has included provisions for the construction of minimum basic recreation facilities, including those required for access, drinking water, sanitation, and the protection of visitors and public property.

Thus it is apparent that there are means already at hand, and new means are being forged, for cooperative assistance in the development of State park programs. The essential initiative, guidance and direction of those park programs, I repeat, can only come from within the States themselves. The State representatives here within this room have the opportunity and ability to make these State park programs a success. We, in the Federal Government, have the opportunity of cooperating with you. To those of us in the Federal Government concerned with recreation, I would say that such cooperation as each of us may be privileged to extend will be valid and useful *only* so long as we truly assist: that our cooperation becomes a bureaucratic *vice* as soon as we try to do for the States what they can much better do for themselves.

Last September at our Vermont meeting, I told you about the ten-year program for the national parks, which we call MISSION 66. I

strongly urge that every one of the State park organizations formulate and promote comparable five or ten-year programs.

MISSION 66, as you know, has been designed to furnish the maximum public enjoyment of the values present in the parks, consistent with maximum protection. The objectives of the program have been spelled out in detail in publications which you all have and are known to all of us here. I need not repeat them here.

One of the items of first importance, however, in your ten-year program is that of bringing up-to-date your State-wide plans for park and recreation-area systems. In the formulation of these State plans, I should like to express the hope that each State will recognize the desirability of protecting and preserving the God-given variety of recreation resources and attractions with which each is endowed, and then determine the best means of carrying that out. I mean by this that your State park plans should include a variety of cherished places and qualities that make your State distinctive, such as:

Your unspoiled natural areas, with spaciousness, the gems, so to speak, of every segment of your State, from the desert and plains to the Arctic mantle of your mountain peaks;

Places to hike, swim, canoe, sail and camp—places for the individual, the family, and for the youngsters of summer camp age—not just for the fortunate few, but for all;

Clean beaches of lakeshore and streamshore; and nearby marshes;

Small natural areas, preserved as outdoor museums for study;

Sites of historic or prehistoric achievement that stand out as great moments in the history of the State and in man's development;

Free-flowing, clean streams and rivers, with all that means to wildlife and boating, good living, good fun, and what we call beauty, as well as such practical aspects as health and general utility;

Trails that lead to areas of beauty and sometimes solitude;

Parkways for driving pleasure, free from traffic congestion and needless hazards, trucking, billboards and other intrusions;

Places for play and sports of many kinds for every season of the year.

Such, I believe, are the kinds of things you want in your State park systems. If you are to have them that will require the recognition of their differences in your planning. Most of these kinds of wholesome recreation can best be achieved in parks, I believe, but some of them can, for all practical purposes, be achieved as well at reservoir recreation areas and on other public lands under multiple-use management. From the planning angle, the problem is to determine the kinds of recreation you want and then the kinds of public reservations provide them.

In our MISSION 66 program, we look to other Federal agencies, such as the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation, to provide recreation opportunities that will supplement those provided by the parks. In your State park planning, it is probable that you will want to do likewise.

One of the most important parts of the MISSION 66 program is the formulation and bringing up-to-date of a nationwide park, parkway, and

recreation area plan, as authorized by Congress in 1936. We are hoping for a considerable increase in our planning funds and personnel next year to make possible more effective cooperation with the States and other Federal agencies, with the hope of publishing the plan by 1961. The national plan should help us to see the entire non-urban recreation picture more clearly.

National parks can occupy but a portion of the picture; the needs and opportunities are so great that only by developing all public land and water potentialities can we come somewhere near the desired goal. As you all know, public park and recreation areas are having heavier use each year, with State parks being used by more than 183 million visitors in 1955. The State parks are carrying a much larger share of the load than the national parks and I see no reason to anticipate a change in that ratio.

Comprehensive park and recreation planning requires reliable and adequate information on all aspects of the problem such as recreation needs, available resources, design and development, operations, interpretation, financing, and conservation organization and policies. MISSION 66 envisions the obtaining and dissemination of such information. For example, there is the expanded park practice program, in which we are cooperating with the Conference, and which Mr. Lykes discussed this morning. This program was set up to serve as a means of exchanging ideas that have been tried and found to be successful in the way of money or labor-saving devices or methods, use of new techniques and material, and the assembly of useful information not readily available from other sources. I visualize that the program will result in assembly and publication of material on designs of structures and facilities that might constitute an up-to-date edition of *Park and Recreation Structures*, and also material on the other aspects of park work. All of this material might constitute a park and recreation-area bible or handbook that would serve all of us.

The recent establishment of a Park Practice Section in this Service now includes a small, full-time staff assigned to this work and promises fine results in eliciting ideas, screening them, preparing them for publication, and distributing them to subscribers of *Park Practice*.

Other studies programmed as part of MISSION 66 include cooperative analysis, with the States, of developing policies, practices and trends in State park programs, with the hope of winnowing out the best and setting them down in written form for the future benefit of us all.

We expect that a study of the use of prison labor in State parks will be useful in recording and analyzing the experience gained in the different parts of the Country. With the help of a penologist, we anticipate that these programs will be studied and analyzed from the standpoint of human rehabilitation as well as that of park development and maintenance.

I know that many of you want to strengthen your State park interpretive programs. Some of the States, notably California, have done considerable work in the field of interpretation of natural and historical features. As a part of MISSION 66 we hope to be able to give greater practical assistance to the States in the development of their interpretive and historical conservation programs.

This evening I have told you the story of how Grand Teton National Park came about. It seems to me that the working of our democratic society in perfecting this great national park points the way for growth and progress in park conservation programs everywhere. I have tried to indicate, also, some of the ways in which I believe that the States and the Federal Government can work together in building stronger State park systems and park organizations. I have indicated briefly the kind of assistance that we hope to offer to the States in more adequate planning as a part of our MISSION 66 program, and I have urged that each State formulate and promote comparable ten-year State park programs.

In all of this work, each of us, as individuals, may be only transient actors in the scene. The State park organizations and the National Conference on State Parks are respectively, I believe, the operating and policy-forming bodies that give consistency, guidance and permanence to the park conservation programs. In all the years that I have been in park work, no portion of that work has given me more stimulation and rewarding pleasure than the contacts I have had with you in the State park field and in the National Conference on State Parks.

In this vein, I should like to go a step further and say that in the State park work one individual has worked quietly and selflessly, generously and thoughtfully, to such degree that she stands out as one of the greatest pioneers and contributors in the State park field. This person is our Executive-Secretary, Miss Harlean James. I take pride and pleasure in saluting her for this work.

This Conference is the effective and logical forum for exchanging and developing ideas as park work progresses. The Conference is the central meeting place and clearing house for all our ideas and experiences. It has important work to do and a great future.

Integration of Outdoor Forest Recreational Potentials with Public Park Programs

C. J. OLSEN, Regional Forester, U. S. Forest Service, Ogden, Utah

IT IS A privilege to meet with you. I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to appear on the panel with this distinguished leadership in the field of public recreation and to represent the Chief of the U. S. Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture. While I am representing the Chief at this meeting, what I have to say are my own ideas. Therefore, if you have any criticism, "jump" on me, not on the Chief.

The objectives and aims of this conference are clear-cut and constructive. Here we have an opportunity to present our problems and exchange some of our ideas. I am certain that all of us have our share of challenging recreation problems waiting for us back home. Here, working as a team, and benefiting from the experiences of others, we will have an opportunity to sift the many ideas that will be tossed into the pot and we may go home with some that will help us solve some of our own problems.

The American lives a complex life. It is studded with great incentives, great efforts, great responsibilities, great rewards and is highly competitive. It is crowded—with people, with buildings, with machines, with automobiles. It is a life that, too often, is tense. Partial relaxation may be achieved at the theatre, a concert, a sports event. But, here again, we are hemmed in by fellow humans. To reach that feeling of complete relaxation there seems to be only one sure avenue of access—it's the road that leads to the great out-of-doors.

With shorter hours of work, more leisure time, paid vacations, earlier retirements, easier accessibility, improved transportation, and a skyrocketing population, thousands upon thousands of people who have never traversed the road to outdoor recreation before are using it. Many like it so well that they are coming back again and again. Some of this interest in the out-of-doors might be attributed to the desire for a brief respite from the critical state in which our world finds itself, and some of it might be a silent protest against the confining demands that TV is making upon us. Whatever the reasons, and there are many, those of us having responsibilities of leadership in public recreation know that the available facilities, almost universally, are far below the present rapidly expanding needs. Looming before us is the space requirement for improved areas. It is an ever-mounting problem with the need for expansion, improvement, and development of more areas continually plaguing us.

I regret to report that recreational developments on national forest lands are far below our present day needs. Unfortunately, this outdoor recreation situation is similar on most of the lands in public ownership.

It is logical to assume, therefore, that it will take the utmost effort at the city, county, state, and federal levels to meet those rapidly expanding public recreational demands. Like many of the organizations that you represent, the U. S. Forest Service is in this service of outdoor recreation right up to its neck.

The national forests include many resources—water, wildlife, timber, forage, and recreation—to mention a few. They are for use but not to be abused. They belong to all of the people. The demand for these resources from all segments of the population is now very heavy and the pressure is increasing. Our management plans are being developed on a long-range basis to provide the greatest good for the greatest number in the long run. It is intended that every acre of national forest land shall contribute its utmost in services to the people. The management of national forests is a complex job and certainly a dynamic one.

However, it is not my intention to discuss all the multiple uses of the national forests on this panel. I shall concentrate on one of our most important uses—national forest recreation. It is a use that always receives full consideration in our program of forest management.

As I view the outdoor recreation picture, it appears to be about as follows:

The cities and towns have a responsibility to provide appropriate types of city recreational facilities within and adjacent to their environs.

In states in which national forests, national parks and monuments are located, the U. S. Forest Service and National Park Service have the responsibility for developing, maintaining, and managing the outdoor recreational resources in these nationally important mountain areas.

In the West the State Park System might well develop the area between the cities and towns and the national forests, national parks and monuments as well as to develop, in many cases, special features.

A few far-sighted private owners of forest land are becoming interested and active in providing recreational opportunities.

We in the U. S. Forest Service welcome developments in the county and state park systems for the general good and to help relieve the pressures of over-use in many places on the national forests and in the national parks.

I believe there is a need at the present time for a strong state park and state forest system in each of the States in the Intermountain area as well as in all States throughout the Nation to help meet the ever-increasing demand for outdoor recreation.

Just to give you an idea of the pressing need for public recreation, I have a chart which shows that the number of visits to the national forests in 1955 was 45,700,000—nearly twice as many as the 24 million visits in 1948, only 7 years ago—and the increase in use is continuing with no letup in sight.

On the 19 national forests of the Intermountain Region, containing about 31 million acres, there were over 6 million recreational visits in 1955.

The kind of facilities provided by the U. S. Forest Service at public camp and picnic grounds are limited to those essential for safety, sanitation, fire protection, with moderate provision for the comfort and convenience of the people who visit the areas. They include safe water supplies, toilets, fire places, tables, and garbage pits.

In our planning and action programs we attempt to preserve as much freedom as possible in the use of the national forests for recreation. Restrictions are limited to those needed for protection of the resource.

We are taking care of a lot of people of the national forests in established camp, picnic, and winter sports areas. In many places under a weekday use we are able to do a fair job of it, but we are constantly faced with an overload of weekend and holiday use on many of the most available improved areas. On some of the national forests we are overcrowded most of the time. We are literally swamped in many places by this expanding tide of humanity. Because of this overflow there is now much camping and picnicking on unimproved areas which complicates sanitation and fire control and in many places is a safety hazard.

The situation is similar on many other outdoor areas.

In the national forests of the United States there are about 4500 areas improved for summer recreation in the form of camping and picnicking and approximately 200 areas improved for skiing and other winter sports. Many of these developed areas, however, contain improvements and facilities which were installed during the CCC program of the 30's. Some of these have been completely worn out and others have deteriorated from age and overuse and are now in urgent need of replacement.

We are deferring and rotating the use on some heavily used areas as a means of restoring the values. In a few cases we have closed areas pending their recovery.

Plans and programs have been perfected so that improvement of existing and new camp, picnic, and winter sports areas can go forward as rapidly as funds and manpower becomes available with which to construct and install the needed improvements and facilities.

In addition to the opportunities for camping, picnicking, fishing, hunting, riding, hiking, boating, swimming, and winter sports, some areas are classified for organization camps, resorts essential to public service, club houses, and summer homes. Within the framework of our multiple use system, the program includes special features of interest such as wilderness areas, wild areas, scenic, virgin, natural, archeologic, geologic, and historic areas.

There are 78 wild and wilderness areas on the national forests of the United States and Alaska available to those who prefer this stimulating type of outdoor recreation.

The national forests are located in 40 states, Alaska, and Puerto Rico—150 national forests with over 180 million acres of national forest land. Potentially they contain some of the finest mountain recreational areas in the United States. The opportunities for outdoor mountain recreation are many and varied. There is an appeal for every kind of user and for almost every kind of outdoor recreational use.

While the U. S. Forest Service and the National Park Service developments fill a special need for mountain recreation which is rapidly expanding, there is also a need for development of state, county, and city recreational areas.

Many states are already doing good work in developing state parks and forests and other special features.

Some State Highway Departments are doing an outstanding job of constructing and maintaining small but highly important roadside picnic and rest parks along the highways. These could very well be extended to all states. They fill an important public need, both from a recreational and safety point of view.

Briefly, here is a sample of our cooperative efforts with state and county programs:

We are doing our best in cooperation with the State Fish and Game Departments to restore and improve the habitat for fish and game species.

In the California Region, five areas on the national forests are under permit in connection with state park programs.

In Utah the U. S. Forest Service cooperated in the development stage of the Vernal State Park program. This project includes a museum which features the geology and paleontology of the Uintah Basin and Uinta Mountains. The museum is a unique educational institution. The Uinta Mountains are largely in the Ashley National Forest in Utah. One feature of interest is the exposed formations up the slope of the mountain which comprises a partial cross-section of the earth. In cooperating with the state park program the U. S. Forest Service has posted the roadside identifying each of the formations through the national forest, all the way to the summit of the Uinta Mountains as they unfold the geologic history of upwards of a billion years. It is called "The Drive Through the Ages."

The U. S. Forest Service in this region is cooperating with the State Park Commission of Nevada in connection with the planning and use of a small national forest area toward the development of the Nevada Ichthyosaur State Park. This is in the state park program and is based wholly on the geology and paleontology of the locality. The special attraction here is the exposed fossils of the giant ichthyosaur, a prehistoric marine reptile with a fish-shaped body and porpoise-like snout. Its existence was somewhat contemporaneous with the dinosaur which covered a period quite similar in geologic time. The adjacent national

forest lands will be administered with full recognition of the importance of this unique state park project.

We now have under consideration a cooperative program with the State Park and Beaches Commission of California in the Grover Hot Springs area above Markleeville on the Toiyabe National Forest. Here, too, the U. S. Forest Service in its multiple use responsibility will give consideration to this program in the development and management of the surrounding national forest lands.

We also strive to coordinate our classification, planning, and development of recreation areas on the approaches to the national parks and monuments with programs of the National Park Service. There is a close Forest Supervisor-Park Superintendent working relationship in these matters.

The states and counties are cooperating with us in the Intermountain Region in the construction and maintenance of roads and highways leading to national forest recreational areas. For instance, snow removal, from the approaches to national forest winter sports areas, is a field in which we enjoy excellent cooperation from the city, county, and state organizations in which these areas are located. The Alta-Brighton area on the Wasatch National Forest, Utah; the Reno Bowl, Toiyabe National Forest, Nevada; and the Bogus Basin on the Boise National Forest, Idaho, are examples of areas in which this cooperative program of snow removal is functioning.

We have many cooperative agreements with local governments in the development and operation of recreation areas and features of interest in the national forests, particularly in matters of sanitation control.

We have cooperative programs with the Bureau of Reclamation for the development of recreation resources around the shore area of the Palisades Reservoir in Idaho and Wyoming on the Targhee and Caribou National Forests and around the Pineview Reservoir on the Cache National Forest in Utah. This cooperation is the result of an authorization and appropriation to the Bureau of Reclamation of non-reimbursable funds for developing recreation use around these reservoir projects. Under the authorization and cooperative agreement, these funds are turned over to the U. S. Forest Service for planning and developing of recreational sites on lands acquired by the Bureau of Reclamation and on national forest lands withdrawn for Bureau of Reclamation purposes.

Master plans for these areas have been developed by the U. S. Forest Service and approved by the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Park Service, which reviewed and approved them for the Bureau. The initial planning is completed. Construction work under direction of the U. S. Forest Service has already started on the recreation areas around the Palisades Reservoir. It will soon be under way on the area planned for development around the Pineview Reservoir. The pur-

pose of the master plans is to provide a guide for planwise development of the entire area, to classify the area according to its highest use, and to show the desired coordinated use of the area according to our best estimate of future recreational demands around these reservoirs.

On the Palisades plan you will note that we are planning expansion and development of trailer camps. There is a tremendous transition taking place at the present time in which house trailers are replacing tents. We believe this transition will continue and that provision in the future must be made for expanded trailer camp use. They present a tremendous problem of providing sanitation, but somehow this must be satisfactorily solved.

A large share of the water used in the valleys originates on the national forests. In planning and developing national forest recreation areas we have a vital responsibility in providing sanitary protection to the water supply.

Special consideration must also be given timbered areas where heavy recreational use is made. Specifically, I refer to the harvesting of trees from some of our recreation areas which because of over-maturity may be hazardous to the people using the area. Also there is need for removing insect-infested and diseased trees to prevent threatened insect or disease epidemics which could result in loss of all of the trees with attendant fire hazard and loss of recreational as well as timber and other values. Periodic harvesting of some trees on these recreation areas is essential to keep the area in a healthy and attractive condition.

There are times when we all crave space, quiet, and solitude. In the U. S. Forest Service we recognize the fact that one of the important attractions of outdoor recreation is the sense of freedom that goes with it. We try, therefore, to administer our recreation areas with a minimum of regimentation.

In summary, I would like to emphasize that our national population is dynamic. It is growing at the rate of 7200 new persons in the United States every day. By 1975—only 19 years away—we will have 210 million people in the United States. The demand for more public outdoor recreation developments will continue to be staggering. To meet it today and tomorrow will take the combined efforts of all of us. No single agency, commercial enterprise, or individual can hope to even scratch the surface, alone.

I sincerely believe that there is a very important place in the field of public outdoor recreation in which each agency can function without conflict or serious overlapping of agency programs for the good of all of the people. There is need for coordination at the local level. I feel confident, although we may not move as fast as we would like, that only by working as a team can we come closest to meeting our outdoor recreation demands today and tomorrow.

Ohio's Experience in Establishing a State Park Within a State Forest

V. W. FLICKINGER, Chief Division of Parks,
Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Columbus, Ohio

1. By birth date reckoning the Ohio State Park System of over 85,000 acres of lands and waters was seven years old on the 11th day of August, 1956. By factual date it actually had its beginning in 1824, when the purchase of lands for the Ohio Canal System was started in that year. Land purchased for canal feeders are now a part of the Ohio State Park System, more specifically those areas classified as State lakes, such as Buckeye, Guilford, Grand Lake—St. Marys, Loranie and Portage.

2. From this beginning 132 years ago the Division has experienced a colorful and interesting career. To attempt to chronicle all events would make this an historic treatise, rather than the method used in establishing state parks within the boundaries of state forests. However, it is necessary to include a certain amount of historical background in order to bring out the basis of establishment for the present areas.

3. In the period from 1829 to August 11th, 1949, State parks in Ohio were the secondary responsibilities of various departments of State government. The Division of Conservation and Natural Resources in the Department of Agriculture, now the Division of Wildlife, had designated certain of its lands and waters as park area, the Department of Public Works was responsible for canal lands and reservoirs, some of which were leased to the Division of Conservation for recreational purposes; the Division of Forestry under the Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station, with headquarters at Wooster, with the primary function of Forest Management, had as a secondary responsibility the development and management of forest parks, within the confines of State forests. The park development work done by the Division of Forestry, though limited in extent, had been competently designed and constructed.

4. To further complicate the State park picture in Ohio, the Ohio Archaeological and Historical Society, now the Historical Society, developed and administered State parks, of an historical significance. In addition to this are the roadside parks in the Department of Highways; the lands of the Muskingum and Miami Conservancy Districts, as well as the county and metropolitan parks—see Article by Author in the May issue of *Recreation*. Such a situation naturally resulted in a state of confusion, an uncoordinated program, a constant struggle for funds for operation and maintenance, as well as neglect of a park program by various agencies, whose primary function and interest was in some other field.

5. Recognizing that Ohio lacked a state park program, as such, various Ohioans had long advocated that a specific park agency be set up. However, it was not until 1949 that such a dream became a reality. On August 11, 1949, Senate Bill 13, passed by the General Assembly, became effective. It created a Department of Natural Resources, a Natural Resources Commission and seven Divisions, which are Parks, Water, Forests, Wildlife, Shore Erosion, Lands and Soil, and Geological Survey, each headed by a Division Chief; the Divisions of Parks and Lands and Soil being newly created and the others being transferred from other Departments of State Government.

Senate Bill 13, now Section 1541.01 O. R. C. reads as follows:

"The Division of Parks shall create, supervise, operate, protect and maintain a system of state parks and promote the use thereof by the public. Within thirty days after August 11, 1949, all State properties, the major function of which is park in nature, shall be so classified and transferred to the Department of Natural Resources, except roadside parks of the Department of Highways, and lands of the Ohio State Archaeological Society."

6. Lands of the conservancy districts and county areas are not included in this act.

7. Compliance with the provisions of the bill varied with the several agencies previously mentioned and also with the area problems involved. After the passage of the act and prior to its effective date (which by constitutional provision is 90 days after it is signed by the Governor) those agencies holding lands of park nature prepared lists of their holdings which they considered were of "park nature." For the most part the holdings of the Division of Forestry and Wildlife were involved. Those of the Department of Public Works were already under lease to the Division of Wildlife, (i.e. Canal Feeder reservoirs—now State lakes). In some instances, areas in total were included; in others, partial and joint holdings with specific acreages were designated for release. These lists were forwarded to the Director for his consideration pending the activation of the Division and the selection of the Division Chief.

8. From August 11, 1949 until December 5, 1939 the new division operated with existing personnel and handled only routine operations and going construction projects. On the latter date the author was appointed to the position of Division Chief.

9. In January of 1950, the list of proposed transfers was forwarded to the Division for consideration. In the meantime personnel problems together with organizational and financial matters also were under consideration. Before consenting to actual physical transfer of holdings, a field check was made of the majority of areas.

10. Areas under the administration of Wildlife did not present serious problems, as they for the most part were transferred by total holdings. In this case, equipment and facilities were transferred to the new di-

vision. Personnel in charge of park phases were permitted their own decision to remain with the former organization or come with the new Division. This phase of the change-over was completed rather promptly.

11. In the transfer of holdings from the Division of Forestry the problems were slightly more complicated, although as it worked out, they did not prove insurmountable, even though requiring more time.

Shortly after January 2, 1950 arrangements were made for a conference to discuss and work out procedures for the transfer of Forestry Division lands to the Division of Parks.

The initial meeting was held in the Forestry Cabin at Conkles Hollow in Hocking State Forest. The Director and Assistant Director of the Department; Chief of the Divisions of Forestry and Parks, together with other technical personnel of each Division as designated by the respective Chiefs attended. Director A. W. Marion presided and also acted as the arbitrator when necessary.

After a general review of purposes and responsibilities of the activities of both Divisions, and a discussion of the problems confronting each; general standards or criterion for apportionment were agreed upon, with the proposed allocation of park areas within forest holdings to be discussed on an individual area basis.

Since the Division of Forestry had administered these holdings for many years, they were well informed as to physical features, topographical relief and boundaries. On the other hand the recipient, Division of Parks, was much less familiar with the character of properties under consideration. Forestry personnel were understanding, generous, and helpful in this situation, as were the Director and Assistant Director. As a consequence, there was little or no disagreement in the proceedings.

Time or space does not permit a detailed discussion of each step or the problems involved. Basically the following criterion were used:

1. The active developed recreation area together with adequate buffer strip be transferred to the Division of Parks.
2. That natural or easily identifiable permanent landmarks or boundaries be agreed upon—i.e. streams, roads, tops or bottoms of ridges, contour lines, fence lines., etc.
3. Building, equipment, personnel, and appropriated capital improvement funds, and going construction projects of park improvements on an individual area basis, by mutual agreement.

From the Forestry Purchase Unit boundary maps super-imposed upon the U. S. Geological Survey topographic maps, and from aerial photos each tract was scrutinized with care. In every instance the final result was an agreeable and workable demarcation line. In some instances, the initial allocation was not as large as Parks wanted, but their was mutual agreement that when Parks needed additional lands they would request their transfer through the Director. A subsequent request was made and granted in 1955.

In several areas service buildings were transferred; in some, joint use was arranged; in others they were divided on the basis of contemplated use. Most of the forestry equipment which had been eked out over the years, was retained. However it was possible to arrange for area equipment and tools on a loan basis until the Division could secure its own. In a few instances rental was paid on equipment.

Personnel in active charge of forest areas, such as rangers, fire wardens, and technically trained foresters were retained by the Forestry Division. Also, others who desired to stay with the parent Division were granted that privilege. Personnel on park activities, as well as technical personnel engaged in park development such as Engineers, Landscape Architects, Draughtmen, construction, and others, were accepted and transferred to the new Division of Parks.

Appropriated funds for capital improvements, as well as partially completed projects, together with those which were programmed for park areas were also transferred.

The Agreement was to become effective May 16, 1950, at which time the designated properties were taken over by the Division of Parks.

Thus began the Ohio State Park System in accordance with the provisions of Statute.

In the Fall of 1954 and as of July 1, 1955, a major revision of boundaries was carried out with consequent increase in total holdings derived from the Division of Forestry. The following areas come originally from that Division:

Data as of June 30, 1956

<i>State Parks</i>	<i>Acreage</i>	<i>Forest</i>	<i>Remaining Acreage</i>
Beaver Creek	1232	Entire	
Clear Fork	545	Mohican	2,242.22
Findlay	915	Findlay	890.48
Forked Run	794	Shade River	1,194.79
Hueston Woods	3488	Entire	3,408.04
John Bryan	751	Entire	751.03
Lake Hope	1962	Zaleski	15,214.99
Pike	500	Pike	6,236.98
Strouds Run	630	Athens	977.94
Tar Hollow	540	Tar Hollow	15,626.54
<i>State Reserves</i>			
Blue Rock	337	Blue Rock	4,506.15
Nelson & Kennedy Lodges	167	Entire	167.25
Scioto Trail	248	Scioto	9,581.01
<hr/>			
Total	13264		68,437.13

With the initial transfer of lands, buildings and equipment, there naturally were problems. These occurred most frequently at the field level, and were the result of interpretation by area personnel. In vir-

tually all cases the misunderstandings were of minor nature, and over the ensuing years have been corrected.

To prevent reoccurrence of this situation, one individual from each of the two Divisions involved has been designated by their respective Chiefs to investigate and arbitrate any misunderstandings of field personnel and problems.

By this arrangement each Division is properly assuming the primary responsibility for which it was originally created. With both Divisions being relieved of certain functions more time is devoted to their primary function, be it parks or forestry. No attempt is made to enumerate all of these, generally they are summed up as follows:

- 1.—This Division is relieved of the mundane task of maintaining intensive public use areas, and attendant facilities, such as picnic areas, cabins, beaches, park roads, public contract work, etc., thereby permitting it to concentrate on Forest Management problems and procedures.

2. *Fire Control*—Where park areas are within the Fire Control District, Forestry provides these necessary services with park personnel under the jurisdiction of the Forest Ranger in case of fire endangering State property. Where park areas are located outside the district, it is provided by the Division of Parks, upon recommendation of the Forestry Fire Chief.

PARKS

1. *Bufferlands*—By location within State forests, adequate buffer lands are provided without the necessity of management. Limited timber management by Forestry Division may be practiced. This buffer strip is of material value in presenting private encroachment and also permits future expansion when required.

2. *Roads and Trails*—Forest roads and fire trails are available for public use and enjoyment without Parks Division administration.

3. *Personnel*—In jointly administered holdings arrangements have been effected wherein area personnel may be used to the advantage of both Divisions by sharing the times of designated personnel, and also by having assigned administrative personnel responsible for specific phases of management.

4. *Joint Occupation*—In many instances this procedure has resulted in a saving of administrative costs to both Divisions.

Speaking for the recipient Division, and from comments made by representatives of the others, we believe that our experience in this operation has, and is working to the advantage of all Divisions involved as it places the responsibility for the respective phases at the departmental program where it rightly belongs. Further, technical personnel of the various divisions are available to concentrate on these activities of the parent division for which they have technical training, background and experience. It also permits the development of a co-ordinated State park program by individuals, whose experience is in this field.

Integration of Outdoor Forest Recreational Potentials With Public Park Programs

BEN H. THOMPSON, Chief Division, Recreation Resource Planning,
National Park Service, Washington, D. C.

NEWSWEEK in its article on "The Great American Car" says, "This year, some 75 million Americans will travel an average of 1,200 miles each and spend \$8 billion on automobile vacations."

"The most mobile Americans of all," the article continues, "are probably trailer dwellers, who can rent space for \$35 to \$50 a month in any one of thousands of U. S. trailer parks. Arnold Romeyn, president of California's Trailer Coach Association, predicts that 'one out of every ten persons in the West will be living in mobile homes or using trailers for vacations by 1966'."

These predictions of *Newsweek*, startling as they are, are only about one segment of the whole, broad, complex subject of recreation for the American people. If we could put together all the known factors and trends in the field of public outdoor recreation, I am sure that there would be indicated future demands and needs far, *far* beyond any present plans or programs to meet them.

An authority in public land management ventures the prediction in a forthcoming publication that recreation may well become the major use of public lands.

I firmly believe that the public need and demand for adequate outdoor recreation will somehow be met. That conviction is based, I believe not on simple optimism but on recognition of that quality in all people that makes them want to improve the world in which we live. Therefore I think that we will devise the ways and means to make our park system and forest recreation programs serve the public need completely.

As you know, parks have traditionally been established to preserve our scenic and cultural resources and to provide for appropriate public enjoyment of them. The early commons, squares, plazas, and the later playgrounds and other types of municipal recreation areas have comprised park systems which preserved the areas and made them available for recreation use; and metropolitan and county park systems have performed similar functions. In 1950, the latest year for which figures are available, 1,175 cities reported more than 16,000 such properties with a total of more than 240,000 acres. And, at the same time, 163 counties reported over 900 properties with more than 213,000 acres. The five-year survey now being undertaken by the National Recreation Association will undoubtedly show a substantial increase in these categories.

State park systems were originally established primarily as a conservation measure to preserve outstanding segments of the States'

original domain and later were broadened to include areas essentially valuable for more active recreation. Areas of the latter type—often times designated as State recreation areas—are usually selected because of their proximity to concentrations of population or because of unusual recreation potentials. They are administered under somewhat different policies from the parks and sometimes activities are permitted that might not be considered suitable or practicable in parks. The emphasis is on providing active recreation opportunity. However, these recreation areas are more closely allied to parks than to any other type of public reservation and have consistently been included in the State park systems.

There are now more than 2,000 State parks and related types of recreation areas, with more than 5 million acres, which are administered by 98 agencies in 47 States. Last year State park attendance exceeded 183 million.

The National Park System preserves for public enjoyment many of the great scenes and places of historic events in America. This system of 178 parks, together with 4 national recreation areas, embraces about 24 million acres and, last year, was used by more than 50 million visitors for inspiration, education, and recreation.

This general category of conservation areas which we call *parks* is administered by public agencies at all levels of government, primarily for recreation, using the term in a broad sense. Conflicting and unrelated uses are avoided insofar as possible. Lands classified as parks are usually not available for logging, grazing, mining and other forms of commercial exploitation, and hunting is usually prohibited. Parks are considered to be more valuable for what they preserve and for the enjoyment they give than for any other form of use or combination of uses. They are usually administered by park agencies, whose primary function is to provide an adequate system of public, outdoor recreation areas and programs.

As a first step toward the desired integration of forest recreation potentials with public park programs, it may be well to ask what we mean by the term *integration*. A park executive once said, "whenever people begin to talk about integrating this and that, I suspect that somebody is about to be taken over."

To clear the deck for cooperative action, it should be made clear at the outset that there is no desire on the part of park people, insofar as I am aware, to "take over" or manage recreation on public and private forests. Park men do not favor dual management of lands any more than foresters do. We do not want to manage the recreational use of the forests any more than we want to have forest management come in and take over the protection of park trees.

I think I speak fairly for the park profession when I say that we want to see both private and public forests made as useful for public recreation

as possible, consistent with the primary purposes for which the forests are established; that we recognize that there is great opportunity for the fostering of more recreational use of the forests than has yet been achieved, and that we want to see forest management recognize and develop the forest potentials fully.

By *integration*, then, we certainly do not mean conflicting and competing programs nor do we mean interference with the legitimate and desirable programs of others. Perhaps what we do mean is the welding together of the several parts into a consistent and common-sense program in which each part supplements and supports the others. In public recreation, this can mean, for example, the maintenance of a wildlife sanctuary in a park and the hunting of surplus game in an adjacent forest.

While we are clearing the deck to make possible the kind of co-operative planning that is essential to the integration we seek, perhaps it is important to clarify forestry's attitude toward parks as I have just tried to clarify park men's views toward forest recreation.

Here I would suggest that the two forestry members of the planning partnership extend full recognition to the third member—the park profession. Such recognition would accept the fact that park conservation is a legitimate and desirable field of public resource management, related to, but separate from, forestry; that the objectives and tools of forest and park conservation have legitimate and desirable differences and that each of the professions can achieve and contribute in ways that the other cannot.

To particularize, good park management will not produce saw logs and good forest management will not perpetuate the forest primeval.

If you wonder why I am taking the trouble to bring up the point that forestry's recognition of park conservation leaves something to be desired, I will refer to two straws in the wind. One, the continued campaign of magazine advertisements and pamphlets to prove that park conservation, particularly at Olympic, is wasteful and undesirable even 15 years after Congress specifically authorized that park, and two, the recent experience of a foreign official who came to the United States to study natural resource management. He was told by the forestry profession that his country need not set up a park organization; that forestry could handle the park field.

You will be interested to know that after he completed his study he concluded that there is a need for both forest and park agencies and programs.

The recognition and acceptance of park conservation as a full fledged member of the natural resource management team is basic, I believe, if we are to achieve full realization and enjoyment of the recreation potentials of the Nation's public lands. The kind of recognition I am talking about goes beyond the cordial bow. It is the kind of whole hearted acceptance of the park profession and program that would

welcome all concerned to the conference table to consider what lands might best be classified as primarily valuable for recreation; what measures might be taken to bring about the management of these lands as parks and recreation areas; what kinds of recreation could best be provided under multiple-use forestry and how best to foster and support them, and otherwise to assist in formulating a comprehensive recreation program that all the agencies concerned could agree to and give their united support.

That kind of cooperative effort might even extend to agreement that park agencies are the logical ones to be entrusted with the public areas that are primarily valuable for public recreation, and that the park agencies, in turn, should give whole hearted support to the forest agencies in developing the recreational potential of the forests.

Who would be hurt by such cooperation? Nobody!

Congress has authorized and directed nationwide park, parkway and recreation-area planning to provide sufficient and coordinated outdoor recreation facilities and opportunities for the people of the United States. The kind of partnership approach to this job that I have just suggested would stimulate progress and expedite the work tremendously.

It would then become a relatively simple matter to work out an over-all program for the conservation and use of the Nation's outdoor recreation resources, with logical and consistent policies on administrative responsibilities, land classification, balance and scope of recreation opportunities to be offered, fees and charges, cooperative assistance, and all the other related aspects of the problem.

I venture the hope that the time is ripe for this kind of coordinated, all-out attack on the problem. I am confident that in carrying it out every agency concerned would profit and that the result would be better service to our Country.

Of course, forest and park agencies are not the only ones concerned with public recreation. I have spoken about them only because that is the subject before the panel. The Bureau of Land Management, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, to name some of the Federal agencies, and others participating in inter-agency committees, the States, private organizations such as the National Recreation Association, the Izaak Walton League, this Conference, and others, as well as countless public spirited citizens—all are working toward the better integrated recreation program we all desire. New implements for attacking it are being forged and progress is being made.

The experience I have had in all these inter-agency and cooperative efforts convinces me that the key will not be found in some magic formula, but is within the hearts of those who sit down to the conference table. Are we ready and big enough to take the obvious steps or will we go on forever jockeying for position?

Recreation Needs in the Public Land States

J. W. PENFOLD, National Conservation Director, Izaak Walton League of America

I'M VERY much afraid I don't know just where to begin to tackle this question—it is such a broad one.

I might start out by reporting that a couple of weeks ago I visited a public camp ground on the Grand Mesa National Forest and found 85 cars and parties crowded into facilities designed for 16. Or I might mention that a week later, along Boulder Creek on the Roosevelt, there was a car parked every place where there was room to pull off the road, and a lot of places where there wasn't; that there was a family picnicking just about every place along the creek where there was a spot big enough to spread a picnic lunch. Anyone in the room can cite the crowded conditions in any of the western parks, camp grounds, picnic spots, roads, forests, streams, lakes. There does not seem to be much need to mention these things because everyone here is already fully familiar with them. The success of the National Park Service in getting MISSION 66 under way certainly demonstrates that nation wide we know these conditions exist—that most of us are prepared to support programs that will increase public use facilities.

It is distinctly encouraging that appropriations to the Federal bureaus concerned with outdoor recreation are higher this fiscal year than ever before.

National Park Service appropriations are up 50 percent.

Fish and Wildlife Service up 33 percent.

Forest Service up 11 percent overall, but up 30 percent in the budget item for recreation facilities.

But these increases give us no cause for complacency. Let me cite the Grand Mesa again as an example.

Out of the increased appropriation that area will have a budget of \$10,000 this year and they are stretching every penny. The Forest officials, bearing the responsibility, estimate that to rehabilitate existing facilities, to expand them and provide the new facilities necessary to keep pace with increased use, will require regular increases each year to reach an annual budget of \$50,000 by 1961. I've looked over their plans in blueprint and on the ground. I believe their plans and estimates are sound, realistic and if anything, on the conservative side. \$10,000 today out of a \$4,000,000 total recreation budget; \$50,000 in 1951 out of a total budget that proportionately would have to be \$20 million. (Does that figure scare you? It does me!)

The Grand Mesa area had 40,000 visitors in 1946—280,000 in 1955. Before too long the new highway up the Mesa will be completed. It doesn't require a slide rule to visualize a million visitors a year by 1961—a 400 percent increase over today's number.

The use trends in our public areas, federal, state and local, all show the same picture. I believe these figures are indicative of a constructive social trend—our people want the outdoors, they want creative experience which our crowded, fast-moving, tension-filled urban living cannot provide.

I believe, as well, that the people will support programs to construct and maintain the public use facilities which are and will be required.

Of far more concern to me than facilities as such, however, is space, and the opportunity for people to enjoy space. That the human animal has an innate craving for space is demonstrated by a lot more than visitor use statistics in our parks and forests.

Consider, if you will, the pronounced trend toward suburban living—the dream of “a little place in the country,” which more often than ever before has become a reality. Or ponder, if you please, the thought that each year a greater percentage of people play golf. Is it just another pleasant game, or does the space it offers have a more fundamental appeal than, let’s say, a pin ball machine.

Hunting and fishing year by year attract a larger number and a larger proportion of the population. Sure, greater leisure, higher wages, paid vacations, better highways, faster automobiles all help make participation in these recreation pursuits more uniformly possible. But isn’t space, in the last analysis, a principal ingredient in both? Does the fast growing sport of skin diving offer just a thrilling adventure, or are we seeking a new environment that offers space? Is the vastly increased interest in sailing and use of all kinds of boats perhaps another indication of man’s desire to escape confinement and to achieve the satisfactions of space?

Seems to me man craves these outlets because he has the increasing need—as modern life becomes more and more complex and artificial—for space and the opportunity to recreate himself, away from the noises, smells, and glare of modern society.

Space like time itself is a limited resource. It cannot be stretched—there is no substitute for it. It contracts and inevitably will continue to contract. Every pressure of our society is exerted against it—population, industry, agriculture, towns, highways inexorably bite off bigger and bigger chunks. Resource uses themselves contribute to this pressure, water development so important in the West, timber harvest, mining, livestock operations. And each of these definitely serves to stimulate greater pressures from each of the others. I cannot help but feel that space itself is the greatest problem which recreation will face in the public land states.

I appreciate that this must sound absurd to many of you—the eleven public land states, a third of the area of the Nation and with but twelve percent of the population, or leaving out California, only 5 percent of the population. But that isn’t the whole story. For example

Colorado has a population of $1\frac{1}{2}$ million, but Colorado plays host to more than double that number each year—and the trend continues upwards. The story is much the same in the other ten states. Moreover, most of those folks come West specifically to take advantage of the recreation resources we speak of. So I do not believe we are much better off than our neighbors to the East of us, but with one very important exception. We do have greater opportunity to plan wisely for the future. We have the chance to learn from eastern experience, we have the chance to avoid pitfalls and to build on firm foundations rather than on second guesses. I hope we have the vision, the brains and the courage to do so.

What are some of these opportunities?

Water—water development in the West certainly has a history of destroying or damaging recreation opportunity. Dams have flooded streams, valleys, critical winter wildlife ranges—as well as complicating related resource harvest such as timber. What new recreation opportunity they have created frequently has been lessened or even obliterated by short-sighted policies which have not permitted acquisition of adequate lands around the reservoirs to assure public access; or where provision was not made for permanent conservation pools to maintain fish populations and related recreation. Water diversions have dried up streams or reduced their flow to a trickle, below what can support fish populations or serve any aesthetic purpose. High dams have blocked the spawning runs of fish and so doomed them to extinction. Flood control dikes have channeled water so swiftly, to get rid of it, that the stream becomes a virtual biological desert. Dams have threatened, and continue to threaten, irreplaceable units in our national park system, national forest wilderness areas and wildlife refuges.

Pollution from industry, mining, municipalities and from eroding watersheds have destroyed or severely damaged even more of our water recreation potential.

On the bright side. Maybe it's just a step in the right direction, but the Upper Colorado River Project, which excluded Echo Park dam and included a firm policy of protection for national parks, also included a directive to the Secretary of the Interior "to investigate, plan, construct, operate and maintain public recreational facilities . . . to conserve the scenery, the natural, historic and archaeological objects, and the wildlife on said lands and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas . . . and facilities to mitigate losses of and improve conditions for, the propagation of fish and wildlife," and further, "the Secretary is authorized to acquire lands . . . necessary."

Isn't that language reminiscent of the National Park Service Act of 1916? It sure is. There is a qualifier, I'm afraid, "consistent with the primary purposes of the project." Nevertheless, there is real opportunity provided in this language to salvage a great deal, and to build recreation opportunity into basic project design. It will not be easy,

however. The task will require coordination and cooperation such as we've never had before. The task will require the related bureaus, such as the Park Service, the Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Indian Affairs, Bureau of Land Management and state and county agencies to be staffed and equipped to do their share. It will require the public to be alert and ready to give constructive support, yes, and constructive criticism when and as necessary.

I am convinced myself that if we can get at this job properly, from the start, we may pave the way toward eventual recognition in the West of the obvious fact that recreation, a non-consumptive use, is also a beneficial and essential use of water.

In 1945, New York State reported 500 farmers as using irrigation to supplement natural rainfall. Last year that number had risen to 70,000. During the last biennium, some 26 Eastern state legislatures were considering modification of the old common-law, riparian doctrine of water use and rights, looking with interest at the appropriations doctrine developed in the western states. I would urge you all to study these proposals most carefully. I would urge that you see to it that any legislation adopted includes adequate protection for the recreation use of water.

Progress is being made slowly, and I trust surely, toward the abatement of pollution in our western states. It is appropriate to pay particular tribute to our host State, Wyoming, for the vigorous pollution control program inaugurated just this year.

Progress toward control of pollution from eroding watersheds is more slow. Revegetation of an abused watershed in our high, arid country, with generally short growing seasons is a long process. Nevertheless, sure progress is being made. The real progress, of course, and this is so essential in any resource conservation problem, is in the understanding of people—the resource users, and the public generally.

Soil—I doubt that our people in the West were anymore provident with our soil resource than were their brothers and fathers to the East. We have mined the soil, all in the name of "progress." We've plowed up the prairie sods, we've leached out fertility with bad irrigation practices, we've destroyed vast acreages by seepage and on down through a long list of land and soil abuses. Recently I heard a county agent within this very State publicly say that the productive capacity of his county was only half of what it had been a quarter century before.

You are familiar with the dust bowl. Let me assure you that insidious losses of soil and fertility over vast areas of the West are more important in our future than the striking drama of a great dust storm.

Let me assure you also, that fish, wildlife and satisfactory outdoor recreation are not the products of worn-out, abused and sterile soils. They require the same basic soil and water resources which can produce a bumper crop of hybrid corn, a herd of prime white face steers, a mighty

stand of Douglas fir, or an above timberline slope of grass, willow and alpine flowers.

Progress is being made, we can be optimistic about the soil resource. In the past two decades, Soil Conservation Districts have accomplished more in the sound management of soil than was accomplished in the previous two centuries. Our public land agencies, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Indian Service have made great strides. Theirs is a tough job, intimately joined with a social and economic system which cannot change quickly. I could wish that administrators of state school lands in the West were as uniformly forward looking.

Nationally we have just adopted a soil bank program. In essence it provides the opportunity to retire from cultivation marginal and sub-marginal lands the production of which we do not now need, and which in fact is a glut on the market. As a conservationist, I do not have to be concerned with political aspects of soil bank programs, price supports and farm subsidies. I cannot, however, but be delighted that many millions of acres of poor land will be put into soil building vegetation and trees, that a major source of erosion will be reduced, that a fertility bank will be established against which the Nation can draw when needed. Of course, the fish, wildlife and new recreation potential in this program is immense. Let us hope that recreation planners and administrators nation-wide will make the most of it.

Forests—Any high school student knows of Paul Bunyon, and the organized efficiency with which he scalped the forests of the East, the Lake States, and got a good start on the Northwest. The brakes were first applied tentatively but 60 years ago with establishment of the first forest reserves. The Forest Service is but 51 years old now. It is remarkable what has been accomplished in that short half century. But there is still a long way to go, in the federal, state and private forest lands.

I would urge you all to read the Forest Service publication "People and Timber." It is a pictorial summary of the Timber Resources Review made by the Forest Service in cooperation with the States and private forest products interests. I am sure you will want to dig deeper into the Review itself, particularly as it relates to your own State. The implications for our national recreation future are most important, because in the overall picture, sound timber management will serve recreation opportunity. To illustrate we need only to cite the sportsmen programs carried on by such large private forest operators as Weyerhaeuser and Crown-Zellerbach in the Northwest. Private forests, like all private lands, can serve broad public purposes beyond primary harvest, if people have the interest, goodwill and patience to work out the means.

Wildlife—Wildlife, like people, need living space. It is interesting consequently, that major species have gotten along as well as they have

in the face of civilization in the West. Some species, such as deer, have thrived initially following land abuses—where fires have laid waste old mature stands of timber, overgrazing of grass lands which has permitted encroachment of brush types, and, of course logging itself opens lands to new growth on which the deer thrive. Sure, the buffalo is gone, the grizzly is a rare specimen outside our parks, don coyote has a rough time surviving against poison baits and the cyanide gun. In many areas, possibly a majority of the West, the main problem of wildlife administrators is to achieve sufficient harvest of big game animals to keep their numbers within the carrying capacity of their range. Park administrators have that same problem, in a somewhat more complicated form.

Carrying capacity of the range—that is the big problem of the future. In the mountain states, there is still an abundance of summer range. But when winter comes with its deep snows, deer, elk and mountain sheep must move down into the valleys to survive. And it is in those valleys that more and more people are concentrating; the valleys in which reclamation, flood control and power dams and reservoirs are constructed. Year by year the critical winter ranges contract, more and more of the sage brush flats of the low lands are being cleared for irrigated pasture and crops.

If you have a chance to visit Jackson Hole in the winter, by all means do so. It is even more beautiful then than in summer, if that is possible. Down the valley, on the elk refuge, on the feed grounds of South Park you can see in concentrated form the wildlife winter problem that exists pretty much throughout the mountain country. And consider then what will happen to those magnificent elk herds if any major portion of the valley is flooded out with dams and reservoirs. Or what will happen to the moose, should their winter willow diet along the Snake River be inundated or otherwise destroyed.

The sport fishery problem in the West presents no brighter pictures. Year by year we lose more natural, productive trout streams to reclamation, flood control, hydro-power and municipal and industrial diversions. Reservoir fishing makes some replacement for this loss, and reservoirs do add other water recreation opportunities. These can be greater in the future than they have been in the past, as mentioned previously, if we go all out to plan them that way. I can see no prospect of artificial trout hatcheries replacing the natural production of the past, nor will put and take fishing provide full recreation value in a sustained way. It is but a step toward the tourist attraction of the chicken wire enclosed pool where you can catch trout as long as you can stand the tariff of \$1.85 per pound.

Moreover, as the good, natural streams decrease, more and more of the remaining streams are going into private hands for exclusive use—no longer available for the public. Meanwhile, fishing pressure increases prodigiously. The picture is not entirely dark, however. Better water-

shed management, pollution control, mine tailings control are improving productivity of many streams. Small lakes, not subject to drawdown are being constructed specifically for sport fishing—many of them will become naturally productive. The fishery scientists, of course, are acquiring and applying new knowledge every year toward more productive management.

Parks—I am properly hesitant to talk about parks to this conference. You've all forgotten more about park problems than I'll ever know. Just the same, I want to toss out a few laymen comments.

Two days ago, during the Roll Call of States, you heard the story of state park programs in the public land states. We can be proud of the progress in California, Oregon and Washington. But programs in the other states are rudimentary at best. It is an unfortunate fact that the several states in which the multitude of large and small reservoirs of the Upper Colorado Project will be constructed are in no position today to even provide any consultation on developments around them let alone exert any considered state wide policy of recreation objective.

Apparently the state park and recreation policies are expressed most articulately and vehemently by local chambers of commerce whose objectives too frequently appear to be based strictly upon what will stimulate local business. I understand the National Park Service has felt those pressures from time to time.

We must constantly keep in mind, in the Western States as elsewhere, parks and recreation do stimulate business. But when we place that business first, and use it as the controlling criterion, we are on the way toward losing both.

Public Domain—As was brought out yesterday morning, the Bureau of Land Management, which administers 170 million acres of public land in the West and as much or more in Alaska has no firm recreation policy. Yet those lands, public lands mind you, provide recreation today, particularly in wildlife, and offer great potentials yet untapped. We cannot afford to let those potentials escape us by default. There is another potential in the Public Domain, also mentioned yesterday. The Bureau of Land Management can sell or lease public domain lands to public bodies for recreation development. If on sale, to such bodies, at a fraction of the appraised valuation. The applicable legislation called the "Recreation Act" is Title 43—chapter 1, part 254. I can recommend study of it by State Park Departments, counties, municipalities, Game and Fish Departments and local private organizations such as sportsmen's clubs, service clubs and the like.

Wilderness Areas—no areas in our total recreation system are as subject to pressure, nor so fragile as the unspoiled wilderness areas of our national forests, national parks, wildlife refuges, Indian Reservations and comparable areas under state administration.

The pressures I speak of are not just those of selfish exploitation, but of sound, proper resource conservation as well. There is no desert area, no high mountain peak so remote as not to be explored by those prospecting for uranium, other strategic minerals, or fossil fuels. In the admirable progress of our technicians there will shortly be no forest product, no tree, shrub or plant without economic usefulness. Scientific advancement in the years ahead, and the pressures of population will require and make it possible to manage vast watersheds and forests as precisely and efficiently as the truck gardener manages his few profitable acres on the outskirts of most any metropolitan area. Fire control, insect and disease control, cutting practices which assure greatest reproduction of the desired species, may well increase the yield of water itself. We are on the threshold of these achievements. And we shall accept them gladly, and gratefully. But—there will be no wild lands.

There will be no wild lands, except as we set them aside for that particular and specific purpose.

Just a week ago, I inspected some forest lands, utilized for a period of the year by domestic sheep on permit. It was the best sheep range I ever saw. It was one of the best deer ranges I ever saw. The forest had been fenced into large pastures. Sheep herders were not used at all. Stocking was such as to be well within the forage production of the driest year. Plans are under way for additional fencing, making still smaller pastures and giving even greater control. It is a fine program. I anticipate that in the not too distant future, this or some similar program will be found for wildlife—to increase the wildlife capacity of lands. (We already have very efficient fish hatcheries.) There will be more opportunity for hunting, as a result. But the lands will no longer be wild.

In the wilderness system of our national forests, in our national parks and monuments and in some of our wildlife refuges exist the last opportunity we shall ever have to preserve examples of our wilderness heritage. Areas extensive enough in size to preserve for the future generations the opportunity for adventure, to experience for a time the fundamental problems the solution of which by our pioneer ancestors gave us the initiative, resourcefulness and strength that has made us a vigorous people, to see nature as God made it without our "improvements."

The scientists undoubtedly will preserve examples of "natural" conditions, as controls against which they can check their resource management experimentations. I submit that we shall need as never before such areas as laboratories in which we can check the development of our now human personalities as we move into eras of greater and greater complexity of machines, automation and mechanical thinking devices.

Roll Call of the States

Alabama. James L. Segrest, Chief, Division of State Parks, Monuments and Historical Sites, reported:

Improvements and developments in Alabama's State Parks System have advanced more, during the state fiscal year ending September 30, 1956, than in any similar period since the system began. During the current year funds spent in operation and maintenance, improvements, renovations and new construction have totalled \$985,000, approximately three times any previous year's expenditure. Of this amount \$575,461.80 was spent from funds of the Parks Division; \$110,000 was spent from funds of the Alabama Conservation Department's Game and Fish Division for a public fishing water access area which will be operated by the State Parks System; \$100,000 of revenue from dredging of dead oyster shells in Mobile Bay was spent on new facilities and improvement of old facilities at Gulf State Park, the State's only salt water recreation area, and \$200,000 was spent by the Alabama Highway Department in providing access roads and parking areas in the State Parks.

During the year, approximately \$250,000 was used for operation and maintenance of the Parks System, with the remainder of the money spent going into additions and betterments.

Major improvements during 1955-56:

1. Conversion and equipping of fifteen additional buildings in one of the major parks for vacation purposes.
2. Construction of three new concession buildings.
3. Construction of two new bathhouses.
4. Renovation and improvement of three swimming areas.
5. Completion of a public fishing access area with twelve-room motel having a capacity of fifty persons per night. This project also provides cooking facilities, cold storage, boat rentals, and bait and tackle supplies.
6. Development of two new picnic areas which include picnic pavilions, picnic tables, open door fireplaces, and adequate water and sewage disposal systems.
7. Development of a tent camping area, Alabama's first to date.
8. Establishment of a trailer parking area and thorough renovation of all facilities within Gulf State Park.
9. Pumping up of white sandy beaches on both sides of a 1,000 acre lake in Gulf State Park. This park now has beautiful beaches on both fresh and salt water.
10. Thorough renovation and proper equipping of two organized group camps at Oak Mountain State Park. Perhaps this is the major improvement accomplished in Alabama during the past year. This area, formerly a Recreation Demonstration area, administered by the National Parks Service, was conveyed to Alabama in 1943 and now is operating in excellent condition. At this same reservation a new day-use area has been constructed including a 100 acre lake with excellent fishing, swimming, picnicking and boating accommodations.
11. Opening of Alabama's new 250-acre public lake, known as Tuscaloosa Public Fishing Lake, the fifteenth in operation in Alabama at the present time. This lake, believed to be the world's largest man-made fertilized fishing lake, during its first five days of operation provided 48,562 fish for 5,405 fishermen. These fish weighed 18,139.1 pounds, a little over nine tons. This lake is located within a 1700-acre reservation and plans are to develop the area into a major park to be known as the West Alabama State Park. The need for outdoor recreation areas is great in that section of Alabama.

Attendance at the Alabama State Parks for the current year is estimated at 2,750,000 people, an increase of approximately 300,000 over the previous year. This is a trend over the past few years, only recently followed by increased legislative appropriations to allow Alabama's parks to expand as the need for recreation grows. Next year, 1957, is a legislative year in Alabama, and the State's parks system again will make a bid for the money needed to develop several areas which would help satisfy the public demand for outdoor recreation facilities.

Arizona. Mrs. Lorraine L. Detterbeck, Vice-Pres., Arizona State Parks Association reported:

Arizona is not only the baby State of the Union but its state parks association is also the baby of the National Conference of State Parks. Early in July a meeting was called to form an association and join the organization of the State Parks. While the meeting was only preliminary, committees were appointed to weld the group into a regular organization. About the tenth of August another meeting was held to form the permanent organization, officers were elected and by-laws accepted. The directors and officers have been selected from different parts of the State to better correlate the actions of the Arizona State Parks Association. From the interest shown and the immediate signing up of many members the organization is well on its way.

Arizona had no state parks and only a few scattered roadside parks built and policed by the highway department. It does have, however, a number of large national parks and forests. It is our hope that with the Arizona State Parks Association we can broaden and increase the recreational facilities of the State and prevent much of the area being turned over to individuals for single purpose use. We are advocates of multiple use of both our present national forests and our future state parks.

California. Earl P. Hanson, California Division of Beaches and Parks, Department of Natural Resources, reported:

So much has been written and publicized regarding the monumental budget of the Division of Beaches and Parks in California that I hesitate to repeat the astronomical figures involved. In brief outline, the appropriations, amounting to \$48,017,000, provide for the following:

1. An increase in the number of units from 143 to 190.
2. Eighty-two additions to existing parks, beaches, and monuments.
3. Provision for construction of the first 4½ mile unit of the Redwood By-pass Freeway.
4. The establishment of a program of roadside rests.
5. The establishment of seven new areas and additions to one, none of which was included in the Five Year Master Plan.
6. A reservoir recreation study of those reservoirs existing and proposed.
7. A historical museum in Death Valley National Monument.
8. Operating funds to assume the administration of Lake Millerton National Recreation Area upon the consent of the National Park Service and the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation.

The acquisition projects require no matching of state funds, as appropriations are on a 100 percent purchase basis. It has also been provided that the State Public Works Board must review each appropriation before it can be spent.

Legislation in the 1956 Extraordinary Session of the Legislature placed a ceiling of seven million dollars per annum on the deposit of oil royalties funds to the credit of the Division. This retains the 70 percent formula and further provides that any excess of ten million dollars, of which the seven million is 70 percent, will be placed in a State Investment Fund which may be appropriated for any purpose, including park purposes, by the Legislature.

The impact on the Division of Beaches and Parks of this tremendous program is alarming to the State Park Commission, Director of Natural Resources, DeWitt Nelson, Chief Drury, and the staff. In the first place, it has required an expansion in personnel from 450 to over 550 persons. It has resulted in the employment of a Supervisor of State Park Development to administer the greatly expanded development program, and also a Concessions Officer to manage the special-use agreements. The first permanent field Park Naturalist and the first full-time historical exhibit technician are now busy with the vital interpretive activities of the Division. We are assured that the famous Redwood Highway will be by-passed through the appropriation by which the Division provides one-half of the construction funds for the first segment of the by-pass freeway. The roadside rest program is rapidly getting underway, and the first units will be established by spring of next year, we hope.

All of these are among the blessings.

However, with the greatly expanded program, there are pressures from nearly all of the interested local groups to speed up the program. Many are asking us to do in one year what the Legislature approved as a five year program. With the great expansion of population in California, there is, of course, an increasing demand for developments, and the more than five million dollars appropriated this year is but a scratch on the surface of the much needed facilities for the public, many of whom are turned away because of inadequate facilities for them. Special use privileges are being requested of the State Park Commission whereby State park lands would be put to private and inappropriate uses, such as easements, freeways, public utilities structures, grazing, and logging access roads, which would divert State park lands from the recreational uses for which they have been acquired and are being preserved and protected.

Proponents of more than 300 projects not included in the Five-Year Master Plan are pressing for attention to their projects and asking that immediate studies of them be made. A number of appropriations have been made on a loan basis from the oil royalties, and in one important

case from State park funds, for other than State park uses. Among these are four million dollars for the 1960 Winter Olympics, \$7,280,000 for flood relief, and two and one-half million for a parking area at the Los Angeles Coliseum.

Local operation of State-owned parks through agreement with the State Park Commission has resulted in some endeavors to exploit, through concession constructed facilities inappropriate to State parks, valuable beach lands acquired primarily for beach use by the public. There is also a tremendous impact upon our outstanding scenic and historic areas to crowd as many people into them as the acreage will hold. This means permanent and irreparable damage to rare and outstanding landscapes, as well as reducing the opportunities for the reasonable comfort and safety which most of our park visitors from urban areas are seeking in the State Park System. The pressures for mass recreation, such as on the man-made reservoirs, is causing the State Park Commission to revise its policies and regulations to provide for the myriads of boaters, fishermen, and other aquatic recreational uses.

In the words of our Chief, Newton B. Drury,

"This is not a simple task. It is a very complex one. It involves sound policies and planning, skill in public relations and exposition of our aims, as well as alertness to existing trends. It cannot be dealt with bureaucratically or by rule of thumb. For as Robert Louis Stevenson said:

'There is no cutting of the Gordian Knots of life.
Each must be smilingly unravelled.'"

Colorado. J. V. K. Wager, Head of the Forest Recreation and Wildlife Conservation Department, reported:

We created a new Park and Recreation Board this past winter consisting of chiefs of the State Land Board, the Game and Fish Department, the State Highway Department, the Office of Public Institutions and the Office of Advertising and Publicity and two persons interested in park and recreational matters who were appointed by the governor, one from organized labor and the other from organized business. I feared the emphasis upon tourist income inherent in provisions for the last two members but perhaps my fears were groundless. The two individuals appointed are excellent, well informed, and most cooperative. We chose as our first Director of Parks and Recreation, Everett J. Lee, former State Forester of Colorado. He is interested in parks, a capable organizer and is very familiar with the state and its resources.

The new Park and Recreation Board has asked our Advisory Council, appointed under an act of 1937, to continue in its former capacity.

For the first year we have a budget of only \$10,500. Our chief task is to make an inventory of potential state parks, to acquaint the citizen with the fact that we are in the state park business for keeps, and to make plans for more income from now on. Fortunately several other procedures are helping. The State Highway Department has created

a few roadside picnic grounds where highways border attractive streams and groves of trees, simply by detouring with a little road building equipment and building a few tables and fireplaces. The Game and Fish Department at such places where fishermen congregate has been willing to install toilets and garbage facilities for the convenience of fishermen and to prevent pollution of streams. The State Boys' Reformatory has created a mobile unit for the construction and maintenance of roadside and other parks as we acquire them.

Indiana. K. R. Cougill, Director, State Parks, Lands and Waters, reported:

The Indiana State Park system was forty years old on May 25, 1956. It is often said about people that "Life begins at forty." This does not apply necessarily to public properties, as life began forty years ago for Indiana State Parks.

Although the benefit of forty years of existence brings with it maturity of judgment, experience and the adoption of time-tested policies, we in Indiana are not without the day-to-day problems with which park administrators are confronted each day the country over. Neither do we claim to have found answers to all of our problems. New problems must be solved according to the best of thinking in present-day park administration, tempered with those policies of long standing which have proved to be so effective in years past. We also wish to acknowledge the contributions which other States and the National Park Service make to our thinking on state park administration.

During the fiscal year ending on June 30, 1956, Indiana continued its policy to emphasize high standards of maintenance of present structures and facilities. In addition to the usual maintenance and operation of the properties, major construction took place in the form of: the completion of the new group camp, a sewage-disposal system and bathhouse-concession at Lincoln; construction of four family housekeeping cabins at Shakamak; two four-unit cabins for Abe Martin Lodge, Brown County State Park, where a new wildlife exhibit also is under construction; and continued work on the dam at Versailles which will impound a 230-acre lake. A swimming beach and boat dock as well as a bathhouse and parking area are being planned as the next major construction work at Versailles State Park.

On April 17, 1956, the members of the Conservation Commission authorized the transfer of Cagles Mill State Forest and Recreation Area from the Division of Forestry to the Division of State Parks, Lands and Waters. This action was followed by an executive order issued by the Governor changing the name of this property to Cataract Lake State Recreation Area. Indiana now has 16 state parks, 1 state recreation area, 2 state beaches, 14 state memorials and 1 parkway, the total area of the System now being 49,801 acres. The acquisition of Cataract Lake added

2,349 acres, of which 1,400 are included in the Lake's conservation pool, to the total administered by our Division. A service building and sewage-treatment plant are being constructed at Cataract Lake State Recreation Area; a new modern campground is the next major construction project for this State Recreation Area.

The 1955-1956 fiscal years ended with 2,469,046 visitors to the state parks and memorials. Of this amount, 2,003,718 were paid admissions to the parks alone. During this period, earnings from operations amounted to \$1,004,080.95—marking the second time in the history of the Indiana State Parks when receipts exceeded the one-million-dollar mark. These earnings, plus \$1,421,020.24 in other funds, made \$2,425,101.19 available to our Division during the fiscal year 1956.

Preliminary work has been started on a development plan showing major recreational facilities, for the proposed Mansfield Project. Located along Raccoon Creek in Parke County, the Mansfield Project will be another U. S. Army Corps of Engineers' Flood Control Reservoir. It will be several years before this flood control reservoir is completed, but with its development, Indiana will have another property for recreational purposes. It is probable that this area will be called Raccoon Creek State Recreation Area.

The Chain O' Lakes State Park Project has progressed to the point where about 1,000 acres of the proposed 2,700 acre project area have been optioned by the Joint County Park Board.

Following the acquisition of New Harmony State Memorial, \$3,245.88 was expended in rehabilitating the Fauntleroy Home and making it available to the public. Additional rehabilitation will be done to other structures at the Memorial so that the public may have an opportunity to learn more about this early communal settlement.

FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1955-1956

Appropriations.....	\$ 162,194.60
Rotary Funds.....	1,810,978.42
Post War Construction Funds.....	451,928.17

Total Funds Available.....	\$2,425,101.19
----------------------------	----------------

ENCUMBRANCES FOR 1955-1956

Capital Improvements.....	\$ 392,999.36
Land.....	182.34
Personnel Services, Material, Supplies, Equipment, Contractual Services, Etc.....	1,073,071.46

Total Encumbrances.....	\$1,466,253.16
-------------------------	----------------

Of the \$1,466,253.16 in encumbrances, over \$500,000.00 was spent for capital improvement. Once again, the Indiana State Parks operated during a fiscal year with receipts from operations exceeding costs of maintenance and operation.

Iowa. Wilbur A. Rush, Chief, Division of Lands and Waters, reported:

Probably the most significant thing about the 1956 park season in Iowa was the new and extremely important role that state park areas played in a fight for survival against the drought in many communities in southern and western Iowa. Nearly all areas having artificial lakes became the only water supply for livestock and domestic use of farmers in the immediately surrounding areas. A 3-year drought period has dried up streams, farm ponds and reservoirs leaving not only farmers, but many towns without water. The towns of Bedford, Creston and Allerton were completely dependent upon water from state-owned lakes, and in all approximately 475 million gallons of water were supplied from state park artificial lakes to relieve drought conditions.

Although the drought seriously affected the levels of all the lakes in the State and required the closing of four areas to swimming because of low-water stages, over-all attendance in the parks is running about the same as last year. Approximately 5,700,000 people visited Iowa parks in 1955 and as of August 1 this year we have had nearly 4,000,000 park visitors. As in the past several years we are noticing a continuing increase in tent and trailer camping and we are constantly expanding camping facilities to try to meet this demand.

Probably the most significant increase in use of our state-owned recreational areas is the tremendous rise in water recreation. In the first 8 months of this year we have registered more new motor boats than in all previous years combined. Although Iowa ranks only 22nd in population, 24th in land area, and 35th in water area, it ranked 9th in the Nation in the sale of new outboard motors last year.

The only additional land acquired during the past year was the purchase of .64 of an acre known as Orleans Beach on the south shore of Spirit Lake, Iowa's largest natural body of water.

To take care of the need for expanded facilities and capital improvements the state Legislature during its last session appropriated \$1,173,000.00. Major projects undertaken under this appropriation are the diversion of Mosquito Creek in Pottawattamie County to provide a water supply for Lake Manawa near Council Bluffs necessitated by the stabilization of the Missouri River, the construction of a dam and spillway for Viking Lake in Montgomery County, and the reconstruction of the spillway and dam of Allerton Reservoir. Other capital improvements include the extension of roads, parking areas, picnic areas, camping areas, and water lines. Several new latrine buildings were built using fibre glass roofs which are proving very successful from the standpoint of admitting more light and making maintenance of these facilities much easier. Public reaction to this improvement has prompted us to undertake a program of changing the roofs of all our sanitary facilities to this material as rapidly as funds permit.

Approximately 500 new metal frame tables and 170 waist-high picnic stoves have been installed to test the public reaction to this newer type of equipment. Here-to-fore a small number of the tables and fireplaces had been installed in selected areas on an experimental basis with good acceptance by the public. More widespread use of this equipment has indicated a preference by the public for this type of equipment.

For maintenance and operation of Iowa's Parks the legislature appropriated \$550,000 for each year of this biennium with \$75,000 of this amount earmarked for the utilization of prison labor. This leaves \$475,000 a year for normal operations which represents no increase in our normal operating budget over the past six years.

After a lapse of nearly 20 years, prison labor has again become available for work in state parks as a result of a legalizing act by the last session of the General Assembly. On October 3, 1956, the first group of men from Anamosa Reformatory was assigned to Wapsipinicon State Park which is only one mile from the prison. The men were housed and fed in the prison. During the winter months these men built prefabricated dressing booths for bathing beaches, toilet buildings and park signs which were delivered to the other park areas in the spring. In January a crew of men was assigned to Geode State Park to prepare housing facilities for the first Conservation Honor Camp. At the same time men who would later occupy the Honor Camp commenced work at Shimek Forest. These men were housed and fed at the prison and commuted to the area 20 miles away. In May this group was established in camp at Geode State Park and a new group from the prison was assigned to Shimek Forest. To date we have 50 prisoners assigned to conservation work. This number is very small compared to the program of many other states, but so is our total prison population.

After 18 years of negotiations and planning it now appears that the Army Engineers are ready to proceed with remedial works to Lake Macbride State Park in connection with the construction of the Coralville Reservoir project on the Iowa River. Lake Macbride dam will be built 29 feet higher to prevent water from the Coralville Reservoir flooding the park area. Nearly all the facilities in the park must be relocated and the lake will be increased from 150 acres to 934 acres. Many hours during the past year have been spent in planning and conferences to reach final agreement with the Federal Government on the project.

Three County Conservation Boards have been organized under the new law permitting the establishment of County Park systems. Petitions are being circulated in at least 5 other counties requesting a vote on the issue in the November election. The County park movement has been urged by the Iowa State Conservation Commission for several years and it is gratifying to know that of the four counties that have

already voted on the issue in the first year after the law was enacted, three have accepted and established County Park Boards. With 5 other counties ready to vote on the issue it shows that the people realize the need to develop more park areas and are willing to work for and assume the responsibilities of planning, building and maintaining more areas to supplement our State Park System.

Kansas. Ernest E. Allen, Director, Kansas State Park and Resources Authority reported:

The State of Kansas realizing the needs and values of a more comprehensive and well rounded State Park Development Program, presented to the Governor and the Legislature its request for consideration of legislation that would activate such a program. Governor Hall included the State Park Bill in his legislative program. The legislature passed Senate Bill #187, establishing the Kansas "State Park and Resources Authority." The Authority consists of a nine man board. The Governor, The Director of the State Highway Comm., the chairman of the Forestry Comm., the Chairman of the Fish and Game Comm., shall serve as ex-officio members. The other five members were appointed to serve terms of from one to four years in length. After the initial term the members will be appointed for a four year term.

Three State Park Areas and several State Recreation Areas are under consideration at the present time for acquisition.

Kentucky. Mrs. Ben Kilgore, of the Division of Parks, Department of Conservation, reported:

Progress in Kentucky State Parks under the current administration (8 months) has been marked by policy changes designed to lengthen the season and utilize revenue bonds for improvements in established parks.

We have assumed control of a 3300 acre tract in Eastern Kentucky that will be developed into a new park. The land and a 225-acre lake were obtained by the 12,000 member Greenbo Park Association.

A policy of promoting swimming pool and other construction in the parks through local fund drives coupled with revenue bonds, has gained strong support. This plan releases legislative appropriations for construction of new parks.

The Breaks Interstate Park Commission, governing body of the project at the Breaks of the Big Sandy River, jointly undertaken by the States of Virginia and Kentucky, has approved a master plan for development of this park and is moving ahead with detailed plans in order that contracts can be let this Fall.

In the field of Recreation we have installed horseback riding, table games, and are in the process of building tennis, badminton, and croquet courts in major parks where "family type" accommodations are avail-

able, rounding out vacation for mother and children while father is fishing our lakes. We have found this an effective means of extending the season in fall and spring. Fencing of swimming areas enabled us to enforce safety rules more strictly.

Professional and semi-professional theater groups have staged regular week-end programs at Cumberland Falls and Kentucky Dam Village. Inauguration of informal, inter-denominational religious services on Sunday morning have been widely acclaimed by patrons.

Expansion of camping facilities has created greater volume of park patrons. We have planned a 40-mile horseback riding trail for a two-day trip from Cumberland Falls to Lake Cumberland. Riding, camping and outdoor cooking will be supervised by expert horsemen and campers. A full-time recreational director has been employed for Kentucky Dam Village State Park.

Key personnel from all parks attended a Dale Carnegie Self-Improvement course and highly favorable results were noted in every case according to reports of park patrons who have noticed a change of attitude and friendliness in park employees.

A survey by a nationally known auditing and business consulting firm was made.

A new attraction designed to increase fall volume is a controlled pheasant hunt. Patrons obtain the right to hunt in certain areas stocked with pheasants upon reserving accommodations. This plan is an experiment and will be adopted in a number of our parks if successful.

Conventions and business association meetings in our parks have been promoted constantly through an advertising schedule employing radio, newspaper and national magazines.

A film showing all facilities in the Kentucky State Park system was viewed by 33½ million people during the past 3 years and the system has been featured in the *Saturday Evening Post* and *Look* magazines during the past 12 months.

Clinton G. Johnson, Director, Otter Creek Park, Louisville, Ky., reported: 1956 has brought even more people and with them additional problems to Otter Creek Park. Our Camps have had even greater use than in 1955.

The outstanding improvement is a new state-built road back to the Park which will make much easier access to the Park.

The Day Camp Program was increased and a larger group of children were brought out each day.

The Picnic Areas have been greatly increased and we are still unable to handle the crowds.

We have built a concession building at the Rock Haven Area and have the money for two shelters.

We are located in an area where wells are not practical so our water supply must come from Otter Creek which necessitates an extensive

filtration system. We have completed this year a completely new filter plant to replace our old one. The new plant is entirely automatic which has, for this reason, materially cut cost in operation. The plant was built at a cost of about \$11,000.

Our budget of \$50,116 was presented to Mayor Broadus and his finance committee with additional requests that \$2,450 be added, if at all possible. This was done and our complete budget of \$52,566 was given us for 1956 and '57.

Additional capital improvement money (\$3000.00) is to be granted to us in September.

The 1956 use will not exceed our 1955—total of 125,000 people.

Louisiana. William W. Wells, Director, State Parks and Recreation Commission, reported:

The past year has seen approximately a 22 percent increase in the use of the Louisiana State Parks; a greatly increased recreational use of water facilities, and more interest in tent camping. Group camps have been occupied to capacity, and those in the Southern part of the state were used almost every week-end throughout the winter.

A spot check made with an automatic traffic counter indicates that past attendance has been greatly under-estimated. Counters are now being installed at the entrance gates of all park areas, so that a more accurate use record can be maintained.

The Acadian Bicentennial Celebration at Longfellow-Evangeline State Park last fall resulted in considerable national publicity for that area. A stepped-up publicity program from the central office has been very effective. A CIT color photo of Chicot State Park used in *Life*, *Saturday Evening Post*, *The Progressive Farmer*, and the *American Weekly* brought in a deluge of requests for information on the Louisiana Park System.

Legislation setting up the State Parks and Recreation Commission was revised in the 1956 regular session of the Louisiana legislature to include more ex-officio and more appointive members with their terms to run concurrent with that of the governor rather than on an overlapping basis as in the past. There are now six ex-officio members and nine appointive members.

A total of \$470,000 was available for capital improvements on all of the state parks. This was spent in picnic area developments, a swimming pool at Chemin-A-Haut State Park, two additional group camps, parking areas, maintenance and operational buildings, a recreation building at Longfellow-Evangeline State Park, additional museum and interpretive work, and a new museum building at the Mansfield Battle Park.

A group camp for Negroes was constructed and put into operation on the east shore of the lake in Chicot State Park. This is the first unit to be completed for a full scale Negro area at this park. A similar camp

is under construction at Lake Bistineau State Park where day use facilities will also be provided.

The following new areas were authorized by the 1956 legislature: A public beach at the north shore of Lake Pontchartrain, a small area on Lake Bruin in northeast Louisiana and an historic site, Fort Jessup, near the Texas border, in the once disputed Sabine territory.

A total of \$148,500 was appropriated for capital improvements for next year. It will be used for the restoration of Fort Jessup, and the development of the Pontchartrain and Lake Bruin areas.

An increase of 25 percent in the operation budget for the fiscal year was approved by the legislature, making a total of \$471,479. Income from park operations for the past fiscal year amounted to \$114,000. This is available for expenditure in the operation and maintenance of revenue producing facilities.

The home of Edward Douglass White, Chief Justice of the United States, located on Bayou LaFourche, was restored and dedicated during the year, highlighting an ever increasing interest in historic sites and museum areas which has been developing throughout the state during the past few years.

Maine. Harold J. Dyer, Director, State Park Commission reported:

Steadily increasing use of park facilities has raised the question of where do we go from here. Existing park areas have either reached, or are close to, the limits of maximum design and use consistent with the preservation of scenic features.

Recommendations have been made to expand the state park system by the acquisition and development of new areas, with plans aimed at doubling the basic plant as rapidly as possible. Trends indicate, however, that mounting pressures on all areas will continue as a fundamental problem. To meet this, day use has been regulated to area capacities with reasonable allowances for peaking overloads, and camping has been limited to facility capacities based on the number of campsites.

Demands for tent camping facilities appear to be compounding at the rate of about twenty-five percent annually. These visitors comprise, for the most part, highly mobile family units with a desire to see the country, to live close to nature, and to enjoy the recreation advantages normally associated with day visitation. Plans for expanding the state park system have taken these factors into consideration as well as providing for the acquisition of the few remaining qualified seashore and inland lake sites accessible to the state's population centers.

Maryland. Joseph F. Kaylor, Director, Department of Forests and Parks, reported:

The Dept. of Forests and Parks is this year celebrating its Golden Anniversary of service to its citizens.

Rapid growth of population and the shift of people from rural to urban areas is spurring Maryland on to as rapid expansion as possible of state recreational facilities.

The last census revealed that, between 1940 and 1950, Maryland was the seventh State in the Union in rapidity of population growth. During the last six years this growth has continued to accelerate. In addition the census figures for the same decade prior to 1950 show a 10 percent shift from rural to urban, giving us in 1950 a 69 percent urban population. With shorter working hours for all employed people, our citizens have more leisure for recreation, and Maryland's expanding and improved highways make all parts of the State more accessible.

The result of all this is that our recreational areas are crowded. Attendance records, which are available for only the last seven years, show a 350 percent increase. While we do not yet have the attendance records for the current season, it has been an amazingly busy season.

Confronted with all these circumstances, The Department of Forests and Parks is faced with the problems of not only acquiring more park space and increasing facilities in existing areas, but also of increasing personnel to man the state parks. At the present time the Park payroll is \$118,767,—18 percent of the Department's entire budget, but many areas are still sadly understaffed. The present recreational areas comprise 10,783 acres. Capitol Improvement funds amounting to \$423,000 were appropriated by the 1956 legislature. This was approximately 20 percent more than the State Planning Commission approved as the Department's improvement budget.

The greatest acquisition of park area is occurring along the Patapsco River, where Maryland's ultimately largest park is being developed adjacent to its most crowded population center around Baltimore. The creation of Cunningham Falls State Park in June, 1954, when the federal government returned half of the Catoctin Recreation Demonstration Area, doubled Maryland's state park area. This 4,446 acres of mountain land is becoming a most popular recreation and camping area, particularly for residents of Washington, D. C. Facilities here are being increased as rapidly as possible.

Patapsco Park acquisitions, when completed in 1958, will contain about 8,000 acres extending along both sides of the Patapsco River for 25 miles with an average width of $\frac{1}{2}$ mile. Some 3,500 acres have already been acquired, with the development of six recreation centers. The newest one, Hollofield in Howard County, is dominated by a pavilion, overlooking a magnificent view of the Patapsco River gorge. Campsites, picnic facilities, shelters and playfields offer recreation in a rustic, scenic location for those who enjoy outdoor life. Development of another recreational center at the confluence of the North and South Branches in a heavily wooded section is under way and will be ready to open next spring. Roads, picnic and sanitary facilities have been built this summer.

At Gambrill State Park, Maryland's most popular mountain park, and one of its most accessible, we have increased all facilities during the past year to serve the public demand, particularly camping and picnic facilities. Roads have been improved and extended, parking space enlarged and nature trails extended.

Celebration of the bicentennial of Fort Frederick in May was one of the outstanding park events of the year. This historic old fort, last fortification of the French and Indian War left intact, attracts visitors from all over the nation. Its bicentennial program was a living history lesson in a sylvan setting for hundreds of school children who participated and for thousands of visitors. It demonstrated an acute need in state parks for permanent state facilities in outdoor amphitheaters where large public meetings and celebrations can be held.

William R. Hall, first Superintendent of State Parks in Maryland, who was appointed in the spring of 1954, resigned early this year. He has been succeeded by William A. Parr, long-time Department employee, who is a graduate of Cornell University where he had both forestry and park and recreational training.

We are continuing our use of prison labor from special camp units. This year in cooperation with the State Welfare Dept. we are operating a youth work camp. The idea has become so popular that the 1956 Legislature authorized and appropriated funds for two more such camps.

Michigan. Arthur C. Elmer, Director, Parks and Recreation Division, Department of Conservation, reported:

Michigan's park attendance and camping are down from last year. Weather is largely responsible since we have had a cold and wet summer.

The Conservation-Corrections program continues to expand and we now have eleven camps using in excess of 1,000 men on all types of conservation projects. The Parks and Recreation Division is using the majority of manpower for maintenance, operation and construction in state parks but the labor is also used for many other kinds of conservation work—forest planting, game management and fish hatchery improvement and development.

The acquisition of the Port Crescent State Park site, a 124-acre area on Lake Huron, at a cost of \$300,000, provided the first new land acquisition money we have had for some time. However, we continue to have a heavy demand for land to consolidate, expand and acquire new areas for state park purposes and will request \$3,000,000 for the 1957-58 fiscal year for land acquisition.

We have had an exchange of correspondence between the National Park Service, General Services Administration and the Fish and Wildlife Service in an attempt to secure without cost, or at least at a very low cost, federal lands lying within our state parks. We were not successful, however, in securing them except by paying one-half the ap-

praised value, in spite of having made available to the Armed Forces hundreds of acres of state-owned lands.

Like the National Park Service, we too have our "long hairs" who want "more things to do" in state parks but so far, except for one small pewee golf course, we have successfully kept the parks and recreation areas free from the "amusement type" of recreation. We are also not in the hotel and cabin development business.

The Legislature appropriated \$65,000 for a T-Bar ski lift in the Porcupine Mountains State Park ski area. It won't compare with those you saw in Vermont last year but it will get skiers up a hill which will provide downhill drop of 560 feet in about a half-mile.

The Conservation Commission recently approved the establishment of a ski development in one of our southeastern Michigan recreation areas in which a corporation is planning on installing an artificial snow machine in order to provide 4 months skiing.

The Parks and Recreation Division received approximately \$10,000 for a publication or series of publications to publicize state parks, and we hope to publish an outstanding treatise with colored plates—not as elaborate as National Park Service Mission 66 publication—which will show what we need to provide Michigan with an excellent park system.

We have completed our park and recreation study and hope to have it published with maps and pictures shortly.

We are concentrating on the construction of toilets, toilet-laundry-shower buildings, water and sewage and have in excess of \$500,000 for this purpose for 1956-57. A recent publication carried an item as a headline, "\$500,000 For Privies But No Money For Land."

Minnesota. U. W. Hella, Director of Division of State Parks, Department of Conservation, reported:

The Minnesota State Park system consists of 64 units comprising approximately 90,000 acres. The bulk of its development—as in the instance of most states—was realized through the depression programs of the 1930's. These physical improvements have a conservatively estimated value of over 6½ million dollars.

For reasons of inadequate maintenance funds they deteriorated steadily from 1942 to 1953 when the Minnesota Sticker Act was enacted and a \$450,000 loan of Game and Fish funds was authorized, repayable from sticker receipts, with which to begin a program of rehabilitation. This loan will have been repaid by July 1, next.

The 1955 legislature authorized issuance of Certificates of Indebtedness in the amount of \$525,000 which together with an appropriation from general revenue sources—made available approximately \$950,000 in this biennium for maintenance operation and capital improvement purposes.

Roughly \$235,000 of this is available for capital improvements, major rehabilitation and emergencies (such as major well or power system failures). Of this approximately \$115,000 has been expended in the past year and the balance will be expended in this present fiscal year which in Minnesota began on July 1.

1955 visitations of 2,350,000 will, on the basis of present information, show a slight decrease, however, tourist camping receipt-wise is up 20 percent and organized children's group camping up from 36,000 to 50,000 camper days. The overall decrease must accordingly be attributed in picnicking accountable for by the unusually cold and wet summer.

As to service rendered, we think our Naturalist programs are particularly worth mentioning because of the highly favorable reaction from the general public.

The Naturalist program is operated jointly with the University of Minnesota's Museum of Natural History. Full time Naturalists were employed at Whitewater, Gooseberry Falls and Itasca State Parks. Self-guiding nature trails were maintained at many other parks.

The Minnesota Historical Society cooperated in introducing a series of Historical lectures at Jay Cooke, Fort Ridgely and Itasca State Parks.

What about the future? We expect our visitations to exceed 4 million within ten years. Obviously, this use load can't be met through the existing system without irreparable damage.

The past year through previous legislative appropriation, we have been able to increase strategic acreages in 7 existing State Parks. More important progress is being made in the acquisition of several new potential areas.

We have exhausted the new area potential of our 1938 State Park and Recreational Area Plan and are looking forward to the continuation of this study in cooperation with the National Park Service.

Money is, of course, the heart of future progress.

We are in the process of preparing a ten-year program of necessary improvement with its contingent fiscal requirements. As for the immediate future, we look forward to retaining the gains made and in fact to increasing our capital improvements program in the next biennium.

We are also looking forward to seeing all of you in Minnesota to observe for yourself in 1958.

Missouri. Joseph Jaeger, Jr., Director of Parks, Missouri State Park Board, reported:

October 1956 marks the third anniversary of establishment of the six man bi-partisan Missouri State Park Board, which by legislative act is a distinct and separate body of authority charged with the responsibility of the Missouri State Park system. Missouri's parks have progressed through the years and 1956 is no exception; however, general

opinion is that the law creating the bi-partisan Missouri State Park Board has been the greatest single factor in the continued progress of Missouri's parks.

The year 1955 saw 2,106,825 visitors come to Missouri's 26 state parks. The income from concessions reached an all time high in 1955 when \$127,013.32 was deposited to the Park Board Fund to be used for state park purposes. Preliminary figures for 1956 indicate that both attendance and concession income will be well above the 1955 figures.

The continued demand by the public, both residents and out-of-state visitors, on recreational facilities has required the Missouri State Park Board to analyze and study an expansion of the system. To this end, it is very likely that by the end of 1956 there will be 30 areas covering approximately 70,000 acres of land.

Missouri history was made in early 1956 when Cape Girardeau County residents voted a bond issue of \$150,000 to purchase approximately 3,000 acres to be donated to the Missouri State Park system as Trail of Tears State Park. This was the first time in Missouri that such action has taken place. The location of this park is in conformity with the State Master Plan.

Another first in Missouri State Park history was the acceptance of a 2,400 acre tract, known as Johnson Shut-ins State Park, as a gift from the Desloge Foundation. This park will be developed as a "wilderness" area catering to the campers and users who desire to rough it.

The construction in Missouri's State Parks progressed at a steady pace and approximately \$300,000 was expended on new construction during the year. For the first time in State Park Board history approximately 300,000 forest seedlings were planted to provide trees for recreation for the future.

Montana. Ashley C. Roberts, Director, State Parks Division, reported:

The travel season of 1956 will see Montana reach an all time high in state park attendance. The Lewis and Clark Caverns State Park, the feature park of the Montana park system, has already exceeded last year's record attendance and we still have a few weeks to go before we close on September 30th. All other parks in the system have experienced a heavier use than ever before. We estimate the attendance in all parks will exceed 100,000 this year.

We attribute this increase in our attendance to the nationwide trend that has prevailed during the past several years. More and more people are seeking out-of-door recreation and are looking to the state parks to provide the facilities for such recreation.

In connection with this increase we have noted this summer that better facilities are in demand. The temporary structure and the make-shift items that have been installed to get by temporarily just simply will not do. The folks that come to picnic and the travelers that want to

stay for a while expect to have clean and adequate areas and structures for their needs. Montana needs to improve itself very much in this respect.

We have had only one acquisition to our park system during the past year. Old Fort Owen, an historic trading post, was recently given to the Park Division for inclusion in the park system. One structure remains of the original fort and it is pretty badly run down. We are facing a major task to bring this area up to a point where it can be presented to the public as an historic point of interest.

Our operating funds for the past and current year have not changed from last year's report. Our total budget for this year will amount to about \$47,500.00. Of this amount we will earn about \$27,500 and the other \$20,000.00 is appropriated from the General Fund. This budget permits us to operate and perform a minimum amount of maintenance work and that is all. Acquisition of additional park areas or major improvements in existing areas cannot be considered.

The Highway Commission, under which we operate as the Parks Division, appropriated \$20,000.00 last year and a similar amount this year for our access roads. This has been of tremendous help because without adequate roads and maintenance we just couldn't operate.

So far as the future is concerned we are optimistic. More and more Montana people are becoming interested in the park system and this includes several members of the Legislature. We intend to keep this interest alive and perhaps fan it to a white hot flame by next January first when the Legislature convenes.

We have taken note of the success the National Park Service has had with "MISSION 66." We think this is good and, by the time the Legislature gets into operation, we hope to have "Montana State Parks Project 67" ready to offer as a ten year program for bringing Montana's park system up to a high standard of excellence and where it will be capable of offering a first class recreational service to the people of Montana as well as the many travelers we have each summer.

Nebraska. Jack D. Strain, Supervisor Land Management Division, Game, Forestation and Parks Commission, reported:

The Nebraska Game, Forestation and Parks Commission, along with other state park managing agencies, is experiencing the heaviest park usage in its history.

1955 resulted in the largest visitation at park installations on record and the top of the curve is not in sight yet, with the total annual 1955 attendance being equalled and surpassed in mid-August.

In the period 1949-1954, Nebraska State Park attendance increased 42 percent while budgets increased only 15 percent. This situation changed substantially in 1955 when the Legislature appropriated a 1955-1957 biennial budget that exceeded the previous one by 38 percent.

This budget created a new state park area at old Fort Robinson, which is Nebraska's first attempt at a purely tourist attraction, as well as a number of other construction projects.

Notable among these, are two new modern swimming pools at two of the parks featuring organized camp facilities, and a new administration-residence building at Chadron State Park.

Nebraska was caught with sadly insufficient facilities when the camping boom hit, however, some steps have been taken to alleviate this condition, with more improvements along this line scheduled.

During the last two summers, and for the first time in its history, Nebraska has used reformatory and prison inmate labor on special construction projects. The program has thus far met with no serious incident or opposition in spite of the fact that inmates have been quartered at the parks for the duration of the projects.

We are completing five years of successful management of several major federally-constructed reservoir areas. This has been a rewarding experience in cooperative endeavor between state and federal agencies such as the National Park Service and Bureau of Reclamation. The projects are well attended and have thus far proven self-supporting.

To those of you who do not know it, we regret to announce the death of our long-time Executive Secretary, Paul Gilbert, but at the same time, we look forward to a comprehensive and progressive program under the guidance of our new Director, Mel O. Steen, who took over the helm July 1st of this year.

New Hampshire. Russell B. Tobey, Director, Recreation Division, Forest and Recreation Department, reported:

A report of the Recreation Division for this year alone would not be meaningful for it would not reflect the cumulative effects of the reorganization of state agencies in 1950. Changes legalized at that time among the several departments are still having their effect upon us. The most recent and severe being a catalogue of criticisms from the Legislative Budget office dealing with our administrative and other procedures. A firm of public management analysts was engaged to put our house in order. The many necessary changes outlined in a Manual of Procedure effected nearly all functions within the division, necessitating a rearranging of our staff, their duties, and standardizing of procedures.

Our greatest difficulties have been those of a fiscal nature, facing the matter of expenses of administration, operation, and maintenance and paying back of all improvement bonds solely from the monies collected from park patrons. This has necessitated a degree of commercialization and exploitation in our state park system beyond those within this region. Charges for various park services have been increased in many categories and are noticeably higher than those charged in neighboring States. In some instances they seem to have hit the point of diminishing

returns. Meeting the month-to-month expenses from income which could vary upward or downward with changes in weather conditions, brought about "stop and go" methods which were inefficient. Fortunately, the ski season of 1955-56 developed record income, for the summer was cold—patronage was greatly diminished, though at parks on mountain areas it increased.

Our staff was pressed beyond the usual administrative, operational, and maintenance chores to carry out several capital improvement projects at various locations. These were financed by bonds to be paid back from park revenue. The more important were: replacement of carrying cable at the Cannon Mountain Aerial Tramway, and extension of Sunapee State Park Beach. We were also charged with the layout and operation of some 1500 parking spaces at Hampton Beach and the building of a public comfort station.

It is to be hoped that it will soon be recognized that the expenses of administration, operation, maintenance, and improvement of our system of state parks, historic sites, and waysides cannot be accomplished completely from park income. This change of policy is highly desired before we are embarked upon a program of expansion, which it is expected will be developed cooperatively with our Planning and Development Commission for presentation to the legislature of 1959.

New York. James F. Evans, Director of State Parks, reported:

During the past year the State of New York has accepted a gift of some 300 acres with over 7,000 ft. of sandy beach on the shoreline of Chautauqua Lake, one of the finer of the New York inland lakes. This area will be supplemented by available funds so that the acreage will be increased to close to 500.

A second park area now in the making, with development plans in the final stage, will be located on the St. Lawrence River at the site of the Power Development, near Massena. In developing the combination of the Power and Seaway projects, it was necessary to acquire a fine piece of acreage between the two projects. This parcel which runs in the neighborhood of 2,000 acres will be fully developed by the Power Authority and jurisdiction will then be transferred to the Thousand Islands State Park Commission for maintenance and operation. The park development cost will run a little better than \$2,000,000. While the operating season is relatively short up in that particular neck of the woods, the park will be heavily patronized due, of course, to the tremendous attraction of the Power and Seaway projects.

We have a third project very actively on the fire at the present time at Niagara Falls. The present Reservation is small and subject to such tremendous usage that good top-flight maintenance is practically impossible. We are criticized unmercifully by reason of comparison with the handsome Canadian side. The Canadian Park Commission is the proud

proprietor of the Canadian share of the Niagara water, and the revenues from the Ontario Hydro people are poured directly back into the development of the Park and Parkway System on the Canadian side. This has been going on for years. On the other hand, the American side has had no direct revenue other than straight State appropriations.

As you no doubt know, there has been a tremendous battle in Congress between the public and private power people over who should develop Niagara's water. A public power bill sponsored by Senator Lehman passed the Senate but died in the House Rules Committee. This would have licensed the Power Authority to develop the power with resultant park and parkway improvements. Having failed, the Power Authority of the State of New York has now made application to the Federal Power Commission for a license to develop at Niagara, at a cost in the neighborhood of \$600,000,000. We expect that the Federal Power Commission will turn this down on the ground that they do not have jurisdiction under the terms of the treaty of 1950 between Canada and the United States over a rider attached by the Senate, that Congress alone shall determine the developing agency. Upon the turn down from the Federal Power Commission, the Power Authority will immediately enter the Courts, and we believe that the Supreme Court will decide that the rider to the treaty was unconstitutional. When the Niagara Power Development is placed under the State Power Authority, they will spend at least some \$15,000,000 on park and parkway development on the American side. At least the Lehman bill in the Senate carried the figure \$15,000,000, but if the Power Authority gets the license through the Courts, there will be no fixed limit on the amount of funds which may be expended for park and parkway purposes.

We have this year completed the Parkway Spur into Sunken Meadow Park on Long Island and are in the process of redeveloping that particular park. It is the first park out of New York City on the north shore of the Island and with the Parkway completed will become a Jones Beach of the north shore.

We are this year also completing the acquisition of Lake Taghkanic. It has taken us six years, but we have finally acquired some 2,000 acres and the complete shoreline of the Lake.

A year ago, I had reported to you that we had put in a new \$2,000,000 development at Anthony Wayne in the Palisades Region. This development included a bathhouse, swimming pool, and picnic facilities. These facilities were opened last spring, and we were immediately overcrowded. We are this year putting on a \$150,000 extension of that bathhouse to relieve the congestion.

The Palisades Interstate Parkway is all under construction at the present writing and will be completed from the New Jersey line to the Bear Mountain traffic circle in the late fall of 1957 or early spring in 1958. This Parkway meets the New Jersey section of the Palisades

Interstate Parkway at the New Jersey line. The New Jersey section stretches down to the George Washington bridge at 176th Street in New York City. The combined interstate mileage will be about forty miles.

Our capital budget this year was \$20,000,000 for parkways and about \$3,000,000 for park construction, land and rehabilitation. The operating Budget for the New York State Park System for 1956-57 is \$9,000,000.

Ohio. V. W. Flickinger, Chief, Division of Parks, Ohio Department of Natural Resources, reported:

I. Accomplishments

Acquisition, 3,197 acres

60 acres by gift in addition to 505 acres reported last year.

Also by gift—Big Creek Reserve, Geauga County

1232 acres by transfer from Forestry Division

412 acres by gift situated on Kelley's Island, in Lake Erie, Ottawa County, from Cleveland Museum of Natural History by Harold T. Clark, President Emeritus

1,493 acres by purchase—cost \$180,989

715 acres Belmont County, Eastern Ohio, new lake site

Purchase unit 1,000 acres—80 acre lake scheduled

778 acres Monroe County, Eastern Ohio, new lake site

39 acres lake under construction by Division of Wildlife

270 acres under option.

Buildings—completed or underway

Boathouse and office 1 underway, change booths 12 completed, 5 underway, Inn 8 room with dining facilities 95%, open fall 1956, Manor House, Punderson State Park—Latrines 12 completed 5 underway—Lodge group underway, Residences 2 completed, 2 remodeled—Service buildings 3 completed, 1 underway, Office Building 1 remodeled, Wash house camp ground 1 underway.

Contracts Completed

Acton Lake—Hueston Woods—Butler and Preble Counties

Dam completed August 9, 1956—bathing beaches and underwater developments underway, impounding to start late fall, 624 acres lake will be created.

Findley—Lorain County—Near Wellington

94 acre lake impounded April 15, 1956, bathing beach road and parking completed and in operation.

Hargus Creek—Pickaway County—Near Circleville

146 acre lake, no development, dam contract completion, Sept. 1, 1956.

Contracts in Process

Dow Lake—Strouds Run State Park, Athens County, near Athens

Engineering contract for dam plans and specification awarded, final plans and estimates 10 in preparation—160 acre lake planned.

Perry County—studies being made for a multiple purpose Lake—water supply and recreation in cooperation with Division of Water.

II. Dredging

389,659 cu. yd. clamshell dredging—channel cleaning

613,114 cu. yd. hydraulic suction dredging

1,022,773 cu. yd. at a cost of .0928 per cu. yd.

53,663, L.F. or 10.16 mile of channel 50' wide cleaned

Complete approximately 40 acres of land fill at Grand Lake St. Marys in Auglaize and Mercer Counties, future development road, parking and picnic area.

Hydraulic fill—Portage Lakes near Akron, for bathing beach.

Utilities

Disposal plant 22,500 gallons per day, underway.

Sanitary sewer system Buckeye Lake, plans complete ready for bid.

Sewer line 1,650 L.F. completed.

Cooperation with Fairfield Licking and Perry Counties state share.

Water storage facilities 75,000 gallons underway.

Other

Beaches—4,400 L.F.

Buoys—lighted 22, camps sites 82 completed, 70 underway

Parking areas for 2,655 cars completed—1,320 cars underway

Picnic tables 1,000, range lights 9 underway; ramps boat unloading 1 completed, 3 underway; roads 8.96 miles completed, 2.1 miles underway. Cost accounting machine installed for record purposes.

III. Attendance

11,822,207—an increase of 1,201,131

47,544—in cabins

16,069—in group camp

190,125—in tent camping an increase of 66,100 over last year 53% increase.

IV. Fiscal

Appropriations: F.Y. 1955-56

Capital Improvements.....\$1,652,350

Maintenance & Operation F.Y. 1955-56..... 661,340

Receipts operated facilities—EST..... 730,754

\$3,044,444

Expenditures F.Y. 1955-56	
Capital Improvements.....	\$1,542,186
Maintenance & Operation.....	1,208,602
	<hr/>
	\$2,750,788
Expenditures F.Y. 1956-57 EST.	
Capital Improvements.....	\$1,764,714
Maintenance Operation & Development.....	1,381,500
	<hr/>
	\$3,146,214

V. Program

Long Range Development program submitted and approved by Natural Resources Commission for consideration of 102nd. General Assembly meeting in January, 1957.

Construction of Dam at Dow Lake.

Construction of Dam, Belmont County Lake.

Development of additional camp sites, roads, parking areas.

Replacement of obsolete equipment, supplemental radio system.

Continue acquisition program.

VI. Legislation

Various study committees of General Assembly

Dock Fees, permits, etc.

Capital planning Long Range—6 year schedule

Capital Improvement—Progress

Sale of Reservoir Lands—Studies, Master Plans, plats in preparation. No sales as yet.

Proposed some form of an admission charge, Minnesota plan favored.

Richard S. Fatig, Engineer-Superintendent, Division of Properties, reported for *The Ohio Historical Society*.

During the fiscal year July 1st, 1955—June 30, 1956 the Ohio Historical Society operated on a state appropriation of \$430,860, divided \$320,460 salaries, \$96,100 materials and contract services, and \$14,300 for new equipment in the general maintenance budget.

In addition to the maintenance budget an appropriation of \$215,000 was available for the biennium July 1st 1955—June 30, 1957. This appropriation was allotted \$50,000 for major rehabilitation of existing structures, \$150,000 for an addition to Campus Martius Museum in Marietta and \$15,000 for the restoration of the second block house at Fort Recovery.

During the past year we have concentrated on major repairs, the development of plans and specifications for the Campus Martius addition and acquisition of property for the museum addition.

Attendance 2,373,810.

A program of highway marking located 1 mile from the entrances of major areas was instituted and as of June 30th, 30 markers were installed.

Admission charges at all historic houses instituted this year.

State appropriations available do not supply the personnel to enable the Society to meet the demands of the public and it has been necessary to use private Society funds to augment the operating cost. These expenditures amounted to \$54,369 divided \$36,969 for salaries and \$17,400 for other maintenance items. We realize that this method of obtaining additional operating funds cannot continue.

Oklahoma. Ernest E. Allen, who has been serving as Director of the Division of Recreation and State Parks, Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board, reported:

Oklahoma has completed the construction phase of its 7¼ million dollar revenue Bond Program, and has opened the new facilities for occupancy by the public.

Facilities under this program are as follows: 81 cottages, 5 swimming pools, one 126 room Lodge, one 124 room Lodge, one 46 room Lodge, one 20 room Lodge.

Added 30 rooms to the existing Lodge at Lake Murray State Park. The other facilities were located in various other parks.

The new Lodges have been in operation for two months and all have enjoyed enthusiastic acceptance by the public beyond our expectations.

The Oklahoma Division of State Parks acquired one new State Park Area to be known as Red Rock Canyon State Park, containing some 300 acres, and one new Recreation Area of less than 100 acres. The new Youth Camp in Greenleaf State Park was completed and placed in operation. The camp will accommodate 250 persons.

State Appropriations to the Division of State Parks was \$1,588,000 for a 2 year period.

State Park visitors this year reached 5 million as compared to 4 million the year before.

The Director of Oklahoma State Parks, Ernest E. Allen resigned to accept a position as Director of the Kansas State Park and Resources Authority. Tye Bledsoe, State Park Engineer has been appointed as acting Director for the Oklahoma State Parks.

Oregon. C. H. Armstrong, State Parks Superintendent, Oregon State Highway Commission, reported:

Accomplishments of the Oregon State Park Program during the 1955 calendar year included provisions for increased overnight camping and day use, the completion of a Five Year Program, and was highlighted by the acquisition of many new park areas.

Eight parks and several enlargements comprising 1,224 acres of land were acquired, many by gift. Six of these were made available for public use during the year which, along with the construction of three new overnight camps, may have helped swell attendance records to new heights. Over 6,800,000 persons visited day use areas in Oregon State Parks, and public overnight camping amounted to 158,375 camper nights. It is anticipated that the usage during the current year may well reach 7,500,000 and 230,000 respectively. The upward trend was reversed in group camping activities, however, in that day camping and youth organization usage experienced some decreases during 1955.

Studies carried out during the year had to do with current problems as well as long range plans. Early in the year, a Five Year Program for Oregon State Parks was completed. This report covered the determination of the amount and location of future expected area deficiencies, park development requirements, and future budget needs necessary to provide sufficient area and facilities for the anticipated increase in park use during the coming five year period. Several studies relating to stream access and problems associated with the construction and operation of boat launching facilities were also accomplished.

The cost of operating the park system during 1955 amounted to \$573,058 of which \$466,884 was required for maintenance and operation of the park areas and roads, leaving \$106,174 expended for administration. Despite a reduction in the work week to 40 hours, we were able to carry out our maintenance and operation schedule with only personnel increases required where new parks had been put into use. Expenditures for park and road construction and betterment were \$343,638, with acquisition, surveys, and equipment purchases bringing the total capital outlay amount to \$426,318. Thus, the gross total expenditure for all park activities was \$999,376. A revenue of \$71,414 applied as a credit, reduced this to a net of \$927,962 for the year.

The usage of State Parks in Oregon has been increasing at the rate of about three-quarters of a million visitors yearly for some time; too, the trend towards overnight camping has been phenomenal in that the average yearly increase of 50 percent has continued unabated since provisions were first made in Oregon four years ago for this type of use. This trend in park use at the state level indicates that there can be no let up in our present program of land acquisition and facility construction in order to provide sufficient areas and facilities for the public's use and pleasure.

Pennsylvania. W. P. Moll, Chief, Division of Recreation, Department of Forests and Waters, reported:

It is always a sincere pleasure for me to enjoy the opportunity of attending these outstanding conferences; visiting old friends—making new ones, in addition to taking back to Pennsylvania the feeling of

accomplishment, for only in such meetings as this can we see the "Trees for the Forests"—it is indeed of extreme import and necessity that we therefore take time each year to inspect our work and progress in a relaxed objective and comparative manner.

Our division of Recreation, a segment of the Pennsylvania Department of Forests and Waters, has made four (4) great strides during the past year, these are:

1. At the direction of the Governor all State employees have been re-classified with respect to responsibilities and work performed. This action resulted from a year's survey and study, and has accomplished the following:

- (a) Eliminated inequities that had existed for years.
- (b) Brought salaries in line with work performed and comparable work in industry.
- (c) Substantial salary increases were realized by most employees of our department.
- (d) Pay day now occurs every ten (10) working days instead of on the 1st, 15th or 16th of each month.

Incidentally, our Department's State Civil Service Bill, which referred to technical employees, passed the House of Representatives, but unfortunately did not receive Senate approval. However, a somewhat revised bill is contemplated for the next legislative session, and needless to say, our hopes and expectations will be packaged in the bill.

2. Recognizing the problems of juvenile delinquency, legislative action has provided for the establishment of several "Forestry Camps" to be patterned similarly to those of the C.C.C. Camps of the 1930's. Campers between the ages of 15-18 will come from our various state industrial training schools, and will accomplish projects concerned with conservation and state parks. A Pilot Camp has been established and more camps will follow this fall.

This is a cooperative function of the Pennsylvania Department of Welfare and our Department of Forests and Waters.

3. Revenues, in the form of royalties paid to the State from oil and gas leases on state forest lands have been made available by legislative action to our department for New Flood Control, Conservation, Dams and Recreation Projects. This act makes some \$4,000,000.00 available each year, and has triggered the greatest State Park hunt in the history of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The development of the first State Park under this program is about to enter the construction stage and will cost approximately one and one-half million dollars. In addition, it is the beginning of our Secretary's program to provide a State Park or State Recreational area, within 25 miles of every Pennsylvanian.

4. Our general State authority, an agency which provides funds from public bond issues, for construction projects related to state institutions, roads, dams, etc. not provided by legislature, has authorized one and

one-half million dollars for State park construction projects. This work involves projects in existing State Parks which have been delayed because of budgetary problems.

You may be interested to know that our Valley Forge State Park will again play host to some 50,000 Boy Scouts in 1957 when they hold their National Jamboree at this historical site.

We are happy to report that the outlook for a continuous and successful State Park expansion program in Pennsylvania, resulting from the above, and our citizens use, need and appreciation of such areas, has never before been so bright.

Tennessee. Gordon H. Turner, Division of State Parks, Department of Conservation, reported:

The Tennessee Division of State Parks within the Conservation Department, was created by statute in 1937. Next year, four land use areas were taken over from the federal government to become our first parks: Cedars of Lebanon, Standing Stone, Chickasaw, and Natchez Trace. Shortly after, Cove Lake, Booker T. Washington, Harrison Bay, Paris Landing, Big Ridge, and Norris Dam were acquired from the Tennessee Valley Authority. Then the USA gave us Montgomery Bell, Falls Creek Falls, and Shelby Forest which had been developed as recreation demonstration areas. Cumberland Mountain, Pickett, T. O. Fuller, Warriors' Path, and Reelfoot Lake have come in more recent years, from various sources.

The value of our 18 parks, covering many thousands of acres, is estimated at \$50 million and, thanks to a beneficent Uncle Sam, their acquisition cost our people through state appropriations, less than \$200,000.

By 1944, Tennessee had advanced in park revenue to fifth place in the Nation and was providing more free recreation than any other State in the nation according to state park statistics. In the 18 years many improvements and additions have been made, of course, and including such as cabins, inns, lakes, roads and trails, playgrounds, boat harbors, and museums. A few years ago, the state highway department assumed care of access and park roads and now we boast a system unexcelled in this respect. In 1950 all permanent employees of the Division acquired Civil Service status.

As generally over the country, our parks are now at an all-time high in facilities, attendance, and operating revenues and, of course, expenditures. In the decade since 1945-46 visitors have increased annually from 479,000 to 3,040,000 for the fiscal year ending last June 30, a gain of 1575 percent. Receipts have risen from \$80,000 to \$660,000, a 1212 percent gain. In this time revenue from state appropriations has climbed from \$43,000 to \$510,000.

Latest national reports (1955) indicate that Tennessee's parks ranked 24th in state appropriations, yet held 3rd place in the nation in revenue from operated facilities, by collecting \$615,175. Under total attendance we stood 18th and in camper days (organized camps), ours was 5th highest in the nation (95,977). That year we ranked 12th in total expenditures, \$1,203,761.

But our accomplishments have not kept pace with our needs and hopes. The use of a full time recreational leader, historian, and naturalist in the parks has been so successful that we plan to add more as fast as we can. We need another park or two at once in strategic locations, and of course, many more facilities and additions.

In the realm of interpretative services we have just begun and it is felt that in this we may expand fast and to the great satisfaction of park visitors. Basically, our parks conform to the pattern of recreational and educational values in areas of scenic, historic, and scientific significance. But just as a modern school plant is of too little value without proper instructional procedures, so are parks without guidance as to their meaning and full use.

Too many people use parks only as places to eat a lunch or play a game, valuable as they are, but for which their own back yards might be even more convenient. We feel it our duty to go far further and with the going, to glamorize the whys and wherefores. Not only may the parks thus arouse a new sense of appreciation for natural resources and their use and conservation but they may awaken more interest in our great past. And further, rekindle a greater appreciation of the beautiful things available in and through our wonderful outdoors. A certain by-product, we think, is a forceful deterrent to both junior and senior delinquency. This is perhaps a new but not undesirable function and attainment of good park administration.

Texas. Frank D. Quinn, Member of the Texas State Parks Board, reported:

Three of Texas' state parks were given extensive rehabilitation during the year that has passed since the preceding Conference on State Parks.

Most extensive was the reconstruction of Huntsville State Park. This park had original construction during the days of the Civilian Conservation Corps. It had been inactive since a flood in 1940 took out the spillway of the dam which created a 300-acre lake about which the park was built. Dam repairs to the extent of about \$100,000 were made possible by a method that has been debated pro and con at former National Conferences. Funds were provided by cutting timber in the park, but the Texas Forest Service designated and marked for felling only trees whose removal would improve rather than harm the forest area. This logging, known as "selective cutting," was done so skillfully that park visitors ask where it was done.

Thirty-Sixth Division State Park, formerly designated "Lake Brownwood State Park," was given a thorough overhauling, which included repair and redesign of many structures.

Goliad State Park, a site of historic importance, had the beginning of a two-year program of reconstruction made possible by a legislative appropriation.

The home of the last President of the Republic of Texas in Washington State Park was restored under auspices of a local patriotic organization.

Rev. Bond Program—\$25,000,000 authorized—waiting on operator.

A highlight of the park year in Texas was formal dedication of Big Bend National Park on November 21, 1955. Former Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay and Director Conrad L. Wirth of the National Park Service were among the federal officials participating in the exercises. Big Bend National Park was visited by many delegates to the 1950 National Conference on State Parks. Since that time an additional road has been completed so that it is now possible to enter either from Marathon or Alpine and leave through the other gateway city.

Ward County, Texas, acting on technical information furnished by the National Park Service, Region III, the Texas State Parks Board and the University of Texas, acquired a large park site in the Monahan Sands for park and museum development similar to that of White Sands, New Mexico.

New sites put under study for possible future park purposes were the *Enchanted Rock*, the *Devil's Sinkhole* and the *Hogg-Varner Plantation*.

Two former members of the Texas State Parks Board passed away during the year—Honorable T. C. Ashford of Texarkana and Honorable Lannie C. Fuller of Denison.

Personnel changes included the appointment of Honorable Andrew M. Howsley of Albany and Honorable Ed Kilman of Houston to Board Membership. Mr. Howsley was elected Board Chairman and Mr. Maurice E. Turner of Huntsville, Vice-Chairman. Honorable Bill M. Collins was elected Executive Secretary-Director, taking office on May 1, 1956, succeeding Gordon K. Shearer—now historian, still active and alert.

Texas State Parks passed the four million mark in park attendance for the year. Popularity of a light aircraft landing field at Whitney State Park directed attention to the growing volume of private plane travel.

West Virginia. Kermit McKeever, Assistant Director and Chief, Division of State Parks, reported:

During the past year four historical monuments formerly administered by the State Board of Control were transferred to the Conservation

Commission's Division of State Parks. The areas are all quite small and will increase the total park acreage by only a few acres.

State park attendance in recent years has been gradually building up to about one and a half million visitors annually, at which point it has tended to level off. With the completion of new developments now under construction, further increase in attendance is expected.

The revenue bond financed state park expansion program authorized in 1955 is rapidly nearing completion. Eleven deluxe cabins at Cacapon and eight each at Lost River and Watoga State Parks were ready for the 1956 spring season. The 50 guest room Cacapon Lodge opened at Cacapon State Park in June 1956, and fifteen deluxe cabins were ready for opening at Bluestone State Park on Bluestone Reservoir July 1, 1956. Twenty-five cabins at Blackwater Falls are complete and Blackwater Lodge, with 55 guest rooms, is expected to be completed and ready to open around January 1, 1957. The 40-room lodge planned for Mont Chateau State Park should be in operation late in 1957.

After the beginning of the \$3,100,000 construction program it was decided that additional park expansion should be carried out. This resulted in the issuance of an additional \$1,300,000 of bonds to make a total of \$4,400,000 for the two bond programs. The additional funds will provide for a bathhouse and concession building at Audra State Park, ten more vacation cabins at Bluestone, one large cabin at Lost River, as well as additional developments at Blackwater Falls and Mont Chateau State Parks.

For capital improvements for the 1956-57 fiscal year, the Legislature authorized the expenditure of \$255,300 on nine state parks.

During the spring of 1956 a Forestry Training Camp for delinquent youths between the ages of 16 and 20 was set up in Blackwater Falls State Park, to be jointly administered by the Board of Control and the Conservation Commission as authorized by the State Legislature. The youths work under the supervision of state park foremen on various capital improvement projects set up for the development of Blackwater Falls State Park.

INDEX

- Ag. Extension Service, 23.
 Allen, Ernest E., 137, 153.
 Am. Automobile Assn., 91, 92, 100.
 Am. Bar Assn., 91.
 Am. Inst. of Planners, ix.
 Am. Pl. and Civic Assn., ix, 1, 93.
 Am. Soc. of Landscape Archs., ix.
 Andreef, Nicholas P., 95.
 Area Dev., Dept. of Commerce, x, 58-60.
 Arlington Co., Planning Of. ix.
 Armstrong, Chester H., x, 153.
 Assn. St. Pl. & Dev. Ags., 20, 25.
 Augur, Tracy B., 50-53.
 Automotive Safety Found., 91.
- Bacon, Edmund N., 89-90.
 Baker, Howard W., x.
 Baltimore Co. Planning, 26-33.
 Bigger, Frederick W., 94.
 Billings, Frederick, x.
 Black, Russell Van Nest, 94.
 Bragdon, Major Gen. J. S., 5-11.
 Bridger, Jim, 97.
- Calhoun, John C., 44.
 Capper-Cramton Act, 61, 65, 66, 67.
 Census Bureau, 24.
 Civil Aeronautics Admn., ix.
 Clark, Frederick P., 53, 84-87.
 Clark, Sen. Joseph S., Jr., 12-18.
 Cole, Albert M., 53.
 Colter Bay, Grand Tetons, 99.
 Colter, John, 97.
 Conference, Nat. Citizens Planning, ix, 1-96.
 Crooks, Malcolm, 87, 88.
 Cougill, K. R., 133.
- Detterbeck, Mrs. Lorraine, 130.
 Dill, Malcolm H., 26-33, 95.
 D. C. Commissioners, ix.
 D. C. Redev. Land Ag., ix.
 Downs, Myron, 94.
 Drury, Newton B., 132.
 Dyer, Harold J., 140.
- Eliot, Charles W. 2d., ix, 94.
 Elmer, Arthur C., 142.
 Engineers, Corps of, 76, 120.
 Evans, James F., 148.
- Fairfax Co. Planning Commn., ix.
 Fatig, Richard S., 152.
 Federal Aid, 12-18, 44-48.
 Federal City, Com. of 100 on, ix.
 Federal Government, 1-5, 12-18, 26-33.
 Federal Power Commn., 77.
 Feiss, Carl, x, 87, 88, 94.
 Fish and Wildlife Service, 77, 120, 121.
 Flickinger, V. W., x, 112-116, 150.
 Flood Damage in Conn., 84-87.
 Follin, James W., 49, 53.
- Forest and Park Rec. Programs, 106-111, 117-120.
 Forest Service, Dept. of Ag., ix, 100, 106-111, 125.
 Fox, Mrs. Cyril, 92, 94, 95.
- Garden Club of Am., 92.
 Geological Survey, 77.
 George Washington Mem. Parkway, 61, 62.
 Grand Teton Nat. Park Story, 97-105.
 Grant, Major Gen. U. S. 3d., x, 68.
 Greeley, Roland B., 93.
 Gutheim, Frederick, x, 33-36.
- Hanson, Earl P., 130.
 Hare, S. Herbert, 87.
 Haskell, Douglas, 95.
 Hella, U. V., 143.
 Highway Officials, Am. Assn. of State, 91.
 Highway Research Bd., 91.
 Hollis, Mark D., 73-75, 88.
 Housing and Home Finance Ag., ix, 9, 36.
 Howard, John T., ix.
- Indian Service, 125.
 Intergovernmental Relations, 1-5.
 Izaak Walton League of Am., 100, 120.
- Jackson Hole Preserve, Inc., 99.
 Jackson, William H., 97.
 Jaeger, Joseph Jr., 144.
 James, Harlean, x, 105.
 Johnson, Clinton, 138.
 Jones, Gov. Sam H., La., 13.
- Kaylor, Joseph F., 140.
 Kestnbaum, Hon. Meyer, 1-5, 13.
 Kilgore, Mrs. Ben, 137.
- Land Management Bureau, 120, 125, 127.
 Langford, Nathaniel P., 97.
 Lathrop, Harold, x.
 Lawrence, Hon. David L., 44-48.
 Lewis, Jack F., x.
 Levin, Dr. David R., 91-92.
 Lieber, Col. Richard, 101.
 Loudon Co. Planning Commn., ix.
 Lykes, Ira, 104.
- McKeever, Kermit, 158.
 McMurray, Joseph P., 37-43.
 Malley, Frank F., 94.
 Marion, A. W., 114.
 Md. Nat. Cap. Park & Planning Commn., ix, 63.
 Met. Area Planning, 12-18, 33-36.
 Mission 66, 99, 102, 105, 121.
 Moll, W. P., 154.
 Montgomery Co. Planning Commn., x.
 Morningside Heights, Inc., 41.
 Murie, Dr. Olaus, 100.
- Nat. Ass. Housing & Redev. Agencies, ix.

- Nat. Cap. Parks, ix.
 Nat. Cap. Reg. Planning Council, ix.
 Nat. Cap. Housing Authority, ix.
 Nat. Conf. on State Parks, x, 97-159.
 Nat. Park Service, ix, 77, 107, 109, 110, 121, 123.
 Nat. Recreation Assn., 120.
 Nat. Resources Planning Bd., 79.
 Nat. Trust for Hist. Preservation, x.
 N. Y. State Commn. on Housing, 37-43.
 N. Y. State Urban Renewal, 37-43.
 Nolen, John, Jr., ix.
 No. Virginia Pl. & Ec. Dev. Commn., x.
 Norton, C. McKim, 18.

 Ohio Historical Society, 112.
 Ohio, Park in a Forest, 112-116.
 Open Spaces, 60-68, 69, 71, 72-73.
 Olsen, C. J., 106-111.
 Owen, Wilfred, 93, 96.

 Packard, Fred, 87.
 Packard, Jean R., 87-88.
 Park Practice, 104.
 Penfold, J. W., 121-128.
 Philadelphia, Pa., 12-18.
 Pitkin, Francis A., 19-25.
 Pittsburgh, Pa., 44-48.
 Planning and Civic Comment, ix.
 Pollution, stream, 73-75.
 Prendergast, Joseph, x, 69-71.
 Public Health Service, 77.
 Public Roads Bureau, 91-92.

 Quinn, Frank D., 157.

 Rafsky, William F., 14.
 Raymond, R. L., 95.
 Reclamation, Bureau of, 76, 110, 120.
 Recreation, Fed. Interagency Com., 101.
 Recreation in Public Land States, 121-128.
 Ribicoff, Gov. Conn., 84.
 Roadside Councils, 92.
 Roberts, Ashley C., 145.
 Rockefeller, John D., Jr., 98.
 Rockefeller, Laurance, 99.

 Rockville Adv. Planning Commn., x.
 Roterus, Victor, 58-60.
 Rush, Wilbur A., 135.

 Safety Council, Nat., 91.
 Scheidt, Melvin E., 75-83, 87.
 Segrest, James L., 129.
 Shurtleff, Flavel, x.
 Smith, Herbert H., 72-73.
 Soil Conservation Service, x, 23.
 State and local planning, 1-11.
 State Garden Clubs, Nat. Council, 92.
 State Planning and Fed. Gov., 19-25.
 Strain, Jack D., 146.

 Taft, Robert A., 14.
 Taubin, Harold, 93-96.
 Thompson, Ben. H., x, 117-120.
 Tobey, Russell B., 147.
 Traffic Control, 91.
 Traffic Engineers, 91.
 Tuemmler, Fred W., 60-68.
 Turner, Gordon H., 156.
 T.V.A., 17, 77, 78.

 Urban Land Inst., 55.
 Urban Planning Assistance, 50-53.
 Urban Redevelopment, 54-56, 57-58.
 Urban Renewal, 37-43, 49.
 Urban Transportation, Nat. Com., 91.

 Vanderzicht, John, x.

 Wagar, J. V. K., x, 132.
 Washington Board of Trade, x.
 Washington Building Congress, x.
 Washington Clearing House, x.
 Washington Housing Assn., x.
 Water Policy, Fed., 75-83.
 Weather Bureau, 77.
 Wehrly, Max S., 54-56.
 Wells, William W., 119.
 Weyerhaeuser Timber Co., x, 125.
 Wirth, Conrad L., 97-105.
 Witcoff, Raymond H., ix.
 Women's Clubs, Gen. Fed., 92.

